



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

खण्ड : 50	शिमला, शनिवार, 26 अक्तूबर, 2002/4 कार्तिक, 1924	संख्या : 30
	विषय सूची	
भाग-1	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि ..	1230—1283
भाग-2	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि ..	1283
भाग-3	अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनेन्शियल कमिश्नर तथा कमिश्नर आफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि ..	1284 —1288
भाग-4	स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन, म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड ग्राम टाऊन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग ..	—
भाग-5	वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन ..	1288 --1300
भाग-6	भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन ..	—
भाग-7	भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं ..	—
—	अनपूरक ..	—

26 अक्तूबर, 2002/4 कार्तिक, 1924 को समाप्त होने वाले सप्ताह में निम्नलिखित विज्ञप्तियां 'असाधारण राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश' में प्रकाशित हुईं:-

विज्ञप्ति की संख्या	विभाग का नाम	विषय
No. HHC/I.L.R. Rules, 1974, dated the 8/9th October, 2002.	Himachal Pradesh High Court.	Amendments in the Rules in regard to publication of H. P. Series of the Indian Law Reports.
No. EXN-F(3)-1/2001, dated the 30th September, 2002.	Excise and Taxation Department.	Grant of exemption in Excise duty any Assessed fee amounting to Rs. 22567/-on liquor to be used for celebrating Raising Day on 1-10-2002
सं० एल० एस० जी०-डी० (1) 3/96, दिनांक: 8 अक्तूबर, 2002.	शहरी विकास विभाग	नगरपालिका परिषदों तथा नगर पंचायतों के अध्यक्षों, उपाध्यक्षों तथा सदस्यों के मानदेय एवं भत्ते दिनांक 1-10-2002 से बढ़ाने बारे इसके अंग्रेजी पाठ सहित।

भाग-1 — वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि

हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट -

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla, the 4/5th October, 2002

No. HHC/GAZ/14-132/82-II-21524.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex-post-facto* sanction of 13 days Commuted leave *w.e.f.* 9-9-2002 to 23-9-2002 with permission to prefix and suffix Sundays falling on 8th and 22nd September, 2002 in favour of Sh. R. K. Mittal, Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM, Kullu.

Certified that Sh. R. K. Mittal has joined the same post and at the same station from where he had proceeded on leave after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Sh. Mittal would have continued to hold the post of Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM, Kullu but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 4/5th October, 2002

No. HHC/GAZ/14-133/82-III-21533.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 5 days earned leave *w.e.f.* 7-10-2002 to 11-10-2002 with permission to prefix Sunday falling on 6-10-2002 and to suffix Second Saturday, Sunday and Dussehra holidays falling on and *w.e.f.* 12-10-2002 to 16-10-2002 in favour of Shri D. K. Sharma, Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM Una.

Certified that Sh. Sharma is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM, Una, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 4/5th October, 2002

No. HHC/GAZ/14-154/83-I-21542.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 5 days earned leave with effect from 7-10-2002 to 11-10-2002 with permission to prefix Sunday falling on 6-10-2002 and to suffix Dussehra holidays *w.e.f.* 12-10-2002 to 20-10-2002 (including Second Saturday and Sunday) in favour of Shri L. R. Sharma, Sub Judge-cum-ACJM (I), Rohru.

Certified that Shri Sharma is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of Sub Judge-cum-ACJM (I), Rohru, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 4/5th October, 2002

No. HHC/GAZ/14-221/96-21550.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex-post-facto* sanction of 8 days commuted leave with effect from 3-9-2002 to 10-9-2002, in favour of Shri Padam Singh, Sub Judge-cum-SDJM, Rampur Bushahr.

Certified that Shri Singh has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Singh would have continued to hold the post of Sub Judge-cum-SDJM, Rampur Bushahr, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 7/8th October, 2002

No. HHC/GAZ/14-243/99-21704.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 10 days earned leave *w.e.f.*

21-10-2002 to 30-10-2002 with permission to prefix Second Saturday, Sunday and Dussehra holidays falling on and *w.e.f.* 12-10-2002 to 20-10-2002 in favour of Shri Barinder Thakur, Sub Judge-cum-SDJM, Gohar.

Certified that Shri Thakur is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Thakur would have continued to officiate the post of Sub Judge-cum-SDJM, Gohar, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 7/8th October, 2002

No. HHC/GAZ/14-2274-III-21695.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex-post-facto* sanction of 3 days commuted leave *w.e.f.* 26-9-2002 to 28-9-2002 with permission to suffix Sunday falling on 29-9-2002 in favour of Shri O. P. Sharma, District and Sessions Judge, Shimla.

Certified that Shri Sharma has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of District and Sessions Judge, Shimla, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla, the 7/8th October, 2002

No. HHC/Admn.-6(23)/74-XII-21715.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him under rule 1.26 of H. P. Financial Rules, 1971, Volume-I, is pleased to declare the Addl. CJM-cum-SJIC, Sundernagar, as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Court of Sub Judge-cum-SDJM, Gohar and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of T.A. etc. in respect of Class III and IV establishment attached to the aforesaid court under head "2014—Administration of Justice" during the leave period of Shri Barinder Thakur, Sub Judge-cum-SDJM, Gohar *w.e.f.* 21-10-2002 to 30-10-2002 with permission to prefix Second Saturday, Sunday and Dussehra holidays falling on and *w.e.f.* 12-10-2002 to 20-10-2002, or until he returns from leave.

Shimla, the 9th October, 2002

No. HHC/Admn./6 (22) 74-VIII-21929.—The High Court of Himachal Pradesh, in exercise of the powers vested u/s 9 (5) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, is pleased to authorise the following Additional Chief Judicial Magistrates in Solan Sessions Division to entertain and dispose of any urgent work, which is or may be made or pending before the Court of Sessions Judge and Additional Sessions Judge, Solan during the ensuing Dussehra holiday *w.e.f.* dates shown against their names :—

1. Shri C. L. Kochhar *w.e.f.* 12-10-2002 to
Addl. C. J. M., Arki. 15-10-2002 both inclusive days.
2. Shri T. S. Kaisth, *w.e.f.* 16-10-2002 to
Addl. C. J. M., Kasauli 20-10-2002 both inclusive days.
at Solan.

Shimla, the 9th October, 2002

No. HHC/Admn. 6 (22) 74-VIII-21939.—The High Court of Himachal Pradesh, in exercise of the powers vested u/s 9 (5) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, is pleased to authorise the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Hamirpur to entertain and dispose of any urgent work, which is or may be made or pending before the Court of District & Sessions Judge,

Hamirpur, during the leave period of Shri D. C. Chaudhary, District & Sessions Judge, Hamirpur *w.e.f.* 1-10-2002 to 9-10-2002, or until Shri D. C. Chaudhary returns from leave.

Shimla, the 9th October, 2002

No. HHC/Admn./Estt./3 (119)/79-I-21958.—The Hon'ble Chief Justice is pleased to sanction 13 days earned leave on and *w. e. f.* 21-10-2002 to 2-11-2002 with permission to prefix Dussehra holidays falling on 12-10-2002 to 20-10-2002 and suffix holidays falling on 3-11-2002 to 6-11-2002 in favour of Shri O. P. Garg, Assistant Registrar of this High Court.

Certified that Shri O. P. Garg, Assistant Registrar is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave after expiry of the above leave period.

Certified that Shri O. P. Garg, Assistant Registrar would continue to officiate the same post from where he proceeds on leave.

By order,

Sd/-

Registrar General.

Office of the Advocate General, Himachal Pradesh

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-1, the 1st October, 2002

No. 3-2/75-III-12878.—*Ex-post-facto* sanction is hereby recorded to the grant of 5(10) days Medical leave on commuted basis with effect from 9-9-2002 to 13-9-2002 in favour of Shri Mahi Dev Sharma, Superintendent Class-I (Gazetted) of this office, with permission to avail Sundays and Second Saturday fall on 8th and 14th and 15th September, 2002.

Certified that Shri Mahi Dev Sharma, would have continued to officiate, but for his proceeding on 5 (10)

days Medical Leave on commuted basis and that this period of leave will count for earning annual increment.

Certified also that Shri Mahi Dev Sharma, was likely on the expiry of leave to return for duty to the station from where he proceeded on leave,

Shimla-171001, the 1st October, 2002

No. 3-6/88-12884.—Sanction is hereby accorded to the grant of nine days earned leave with effect from 23-9-2002 to 1-10-2002 in favour of Shri Ram Murti Bisht, Deputy Advocate General of this office, with permission to avail Sunday & Gazetted Holiday falling on 22-9-2002 & 2-10-2002.

Certified that Shri R. M. Bisht would have continued to officiate, but for his proceeding on nine days earned leave and that this period of leave will count for earning annual increment.

Certified also that said Shri R. M. Bisht is likely, on the expiry of leave to return for duty to the station, from where he proceeds on leave.

Shimla-1, the 1st October, 2002

No. 1-13/98-12880.—Sanction is hereby accorded to grant of 19 days earned leave with effect from 23rd September, 2002 to 11th October, 2002 in favour of Shri Sandeep Kaushik, Addl. Advocate General of this office, with permission to avail Sundays, 2nd Saturdays & Dussehra holidays falling on 22nd September, 2002 and 12th October, 2002 to 20th October, 2002.

Certified that Shri Sandeep Kaushik would have continued to officiate, as such.

Certified also that said Shri Kaushik is likely, on the expiry of leave to return for duty to the station, from where he proceeds on leave.

Sd/-

Advocate General,
Himachal Pradesh.

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

BOARD OF DEPARTMENTAL EXAMINATION HIMACHAL PRADESH

NOTIFICATION

Fairlawn, Shimla-171 012, the 17th August, 2002

No. HIPA (Exam.) 5/74-XXV.—The result of the Departmental Examination of the Officers belonging to other Gazetted Officers (Tech.), H. P. held in April, 2002 is hereby notified as follows :—

NOMENCLATURE OF PAPERS

Paper-1—Financial Administration

Paper-2—Hindi

Paper-3—Rules & Acts for Tech./Non-Tech. Deptt.

Abbreviations used : ABS—Absent, EXM—Exempted, DEB—Debarred from Departmental Exam.

Name/Father name	Roll No.	Paper-1	Paper-2	Paper-3
1	2	3	4	5

DEPARTMENT : AGRICULTURE

S/Shri/Smt. :

Atul Dogra	17054	Fail	—	—
Moti Ram Dogra		37		
Purshottam Chand	17058	Fail	—	Pass
Rumi Ram		23		50
Jagdish Chand	17060	Fail	—	—
Sant Ram		31		

1	2	3	4	5
S/Shri/Smt. :				
Mohan Lal Bharmoria B. R. Bharmoria	17062	Fail 10	—	—
Tara Chand Mian Singh	17064	Fail 22	—	—
Yesh Pal Singh Harnam Singh	17066	Fail 25	—	—
Ravi Kant Chaha Rasil Singh	17067	Fail 30	—	—
Prakash Chand Thakur D. R. Thakur	17068	Fail 27	—	Pass 71
Prem Chand Sharma Damodar Ram	17069	Pass 55	—	Pass 67
Surender Kumar Lt. Netar Singh	17070	Fail 18	—	—
Harish Kumar Sharma Inder Pal Sharma	17071	Fail 17	—	—
Chaman Lal Saklani Parshotam Ram	17072	Fail 22	—	—
Kulbhushan S. R. Dhiman	17073	Fail 37	—	Pass 76
Ajab Kumar Negi Manku Ram Negi	17074	Fail 34	—	—
Sunil Chauhan A. C. Chauhan	17075	Pass 61	—	Pass 70
Shashi Paul Attri Dev Raj	17076	Pass 50	—	Pass 72
Youdhveer Singh Bhag Singh	17077	Fail 24	—	—
Harish Chander Kalja Shiv Ram	17078	Pass 50	—	—
Jagdish Chand Sharma Narain Dass	17079	Fail 14	—	—
Rahul Katoch S. C. Katoch	17081	Fail 37	—	—
C. S. Sharma Nand Lal Sharma	17082	Fail 20	—	—
Madan Singh Parmar L. C. Parmar	17083	Fail 25	—	—
Chander Sakher L. T. T. C. Sharma	17084	Fail 30	—	—
Dharam Pal Kanshi Ram	17085	Fail 27	—	—
Kashmir Chand Sharma B. R. Sharma	17086	Fail 15	—	Pass 60
Hari Ram Rabi Lt Minku Ram	17089	Fail 14	—	Pass 68
Hari Chand Sharma Lt. R. R. Sharma	17090	Fail 37	—	—
Harish K. Thakur Durga Dutt Thakur	17091	Fail 18	—	—
DEPARTMENT : ANIMAL HUS.				
Madho Ram Masand Faqir Chand	71124	Fail 37	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
S/Shri/Smt :				
Baldev Chauhan Lt. D. R. Chauhan	17125	Fail 38	—	—
Harnam Singh Jaishi Ram	17127	Fail 33	—	—
Anish Kumar Lt. Pritam Chand	17128	Fail 32	—	—
Mohit Mahajan R.K. Mahajan	17129	Pass 50	—	—
Dalip Singh Mehta Hukam Singh	17131	Pass 50	—	—
Joginder Verma P. N. Verma	17132	—	—	Pass 69
Shakuntla Sonam Angrup	17134	Pass 50	—	—
Manchali Verma B. R. Verma	17135	Pass 51	—	—
Rajeev Mehta A. S. Mehta	17136	—	—	Pass 70
Joginder Singh Amar Singh	17137	Pass 53	—	—
Amit Attri G. P. Attri	17138	—	—	Pass 72
Ram Lal Shandal Saran Dass	17139	Fail 33	—	—
Hitender K. Verma C. D. Verma	17140	Pass 50	—	ABS ABS
Tara Chand Chauhan Lt. Daulat Ram	17141	Fail 26	—	—
Deepak Kumar Lt. Brij Lal	17142	Pass 50	—	—
Satish Kumar Kapoor Lt. Bhima Ram	17144	Pass 60	—	—
Nagendra Antal B. Singh	17146	Fail 24	—	—
Maneesh Sharma Satish Chander	17147	Pass 52	—	—
Vijay Kumar Prem Chand Pathak	17148	Pass 50	—	—
Ganesh Dharam Singh	17149	Fail 34	—	—
Upender Bhardwaj M. L. Bhardwaj	17150	Pass 50	—	—
Sandeep Sharma Ishwar Sharma	17152	Pass 50	—	—
Arun Kumar Sharma S. D. Sharma	17154	Fail 38	—	—
Hatinder Singh Mehar Singh	17155	ABS ABS	—	Pass 67
M. L. Kaushal Chuni Lal	17156	Pass 51	—	—
DEPARTMENT : AYURVEDA				
Anil Kumar Ranveer Singh	17012	Fail 25	—	—
Kultar S. Dhiman K. R. Dhiman	17013	Fail 29	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
S/Shri/Smt. Opender Kumar Sharma C. Sharma	18810	Fail 14	—	—
DEPARTMENT : ECO. & STAT.				
Naresh K. Sharma L. N. Sharma	17003	Fail 28	—	Pass 52
Jai Pal Singh Negi Lt. S. S. Negi	17004	—	—	ABS ABS
Guru Dutt Beli Ram	17007	—	—	Pass 67
B. D. Sharma H. D. Sharma	17008	—	—	ABS ABS
DEPARTMENT : EDUCATION				
Anju Sehgal J. N. Batta	17256	Fail 36	—	—
Meera Sharma Satya Dev Sharma	17257	Fail 20	—	—
Anil Kumar Azad Roshan Lal Azad	17258	Pass 52	—	—
Anjali Bhardwaj T. S. Farshad	17259	Fail 27	—	—
Anita Kumari Bishan Dass	17260	Fail 26	—	—
Tara Chand Sharma Kishan Dyal	17261	Pass 51	—	—
Raj Kumar Prashar Bhagat Ram	17262	Fail 36	—	—
Sanjav Kumar Gupta V. K. Gupta	17263	Pass 50	—	—
Hit Dev Khushal Chand	17264	Pass 50	—	—
Heminder K. Bakshi B. N. Bakshi	17267	Fail 38	—	—
Kanshi Ram Kankoo Ram	17268	Fail 31	—	—
Mohd Islam Ansari H. M. A. Ansari	17269	Fail 30	—	—
Santosh Rana Roop Lal Rana	17270	Pass 50	—	—
Kamlesh Sharma Dina Nath Sharma	17271	Fail 37	—	—
Dhani Ram Thakur B. R. Thakur	17272	Fail 39	—	—
Chaman Singh Prithi Singh	17274	Fail 29	—	—
Dharam Chand Indoria Prabha Ram	17275	Fail 26	—	—
Dharam Paul Nadda T. R. Nadda	17280	Pass 50	—	—
Narinder Singh Mehar Chand	17281	Pass 50	—	—
Hardeep Thakur Pirithi Chand	17282	Pass 51	—	—
Satish Kumar Sharma Kishan Dev Sharma	17283	Fail 41	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
S/Shri/Smt. :				
Rajesh Kumar Ram Rakha	17285	Fail 38	—	—
Ravinder Kumar Beli Ram	17286	Fail 34	—	—
Subhash Kumar Sada Ram	17288	Pass 51	—	—
Pratibha Thakur Surat Singh	17289	Fail 33	—	—
Jyoti Guleria K. Guleria	17291	Fail 38	—	—
Remesh Kumar Ram Chander	17292	Fail 41	—	—
Anju Gupta S. K. Gupta	17293	Pass 51	—	—
Pravesh Kapoor Lt. Y. S. Vaidya	17294	Fail 36	—	—
Pawan Sharma Muni Lal Sharma	17295	Fail 31	—	—
Nirmala Sen Rajinder Singh	17297	Pass 50	—	—
Sukh Dev Rattan Bhagu Ram	17298	Pass 52	—	—
Surjan Ram Prabhu Ram	17299	Pass 52	—	—
Bipan Kumar Sharma Baldev Raj Sharma	17300	Fail 37	—	—
Rajender Singh Gulab Singh	17301	Fail 36	—	—
Manorma Panwar S. R. Chandel	17302	Pass 50	—	—
Joginder Singh Lt. Milkhi Ram	17304	Fail 19	—	—
Ashok Kumar Ram Chand	17305	Pass 52	—	—
Mamta Balwant Kumar	17306	Pass 50	—	—
Jeet Ram Bansal D. R. Bansal	17308	Fail 38	—	—
Chaman Lal Angirass Kali Charan	17309	Pass 53	—	—
Ram Singh Dhiman L. R. Dhiman	17310	Pass 51	—	—
Rajinder Kumar Prabhu Dyal	17313	Fail 26	—	—
Balwant Kumar Nadda R. D. Nadda	17314	Fail 31	—	—
Satya Pal Sharma M. R. Sharma	17315	Fail 32	—	—
Rajesh Kumar Chandel Malkiat Singh	17316	Pass 50	—	—
Daroga Ram Kirpu Ram	17317	Fail 37	—	—
Rakesh Sharma Kanshi Ram Sharma	17319	Pass 51	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
<i>S/Shri/Smt. :</i>				
Kuldeep Chand Sharma Rup Lal Sharma	17320	Pass 50	—	—
Ambika Gupta Sohan Lal Gupta	17324	Fail 34	—	—
Kusum Lata Surat Ram	17325	Fail 34	—	—
Sarita Kumari Sant Ram	17326	Fail 22	—	—
Anjali Sharma J. R. Sharma	17327	Fail 35	—	—
Dalip Singh Thakur Lal Singh	17330	Fail 24	—	—
Saroj Bhardwaj C. R. Bhardwaj	17331	Fail 24	—	—
Bhag Singh Ram Lal	17332	Fail 24	—	—
Bhupinder Kumar Nokh Ram	17333	Fail 26	—	—
Rafeek Alam Babu Ram	17336	Fail 33	—	—
Pawan Kumar Jagdish Chand	17337	Pass 50	—	—
Pawan Kumar Puran Chand	17338	Fail 16	—	—
Chaman Singh Prithi Singh	17339	Fail 22	—	—
Manoj Kumar Sharma M. N. Sharma	17340	Fail 31	—	—
Deep Chand Kaushal Prem Chand	17341	Fail 32	—	—
Ravinder Kumar Amar Nath Thakur	17350	Fail 19	—	—
Ogar Singh Chauhan Sukh Ram Chauhan	17351	Fail 10	—	—
Amar Singh Prashar Rijha Ram	17353	Fail 22	—	—
Shankar Bhagat Negi Lt. Kanai Singh	17355	Fail 20	—	—
Janak Raj Aerry Jagan Nath Aerry	17359	Pass 51	—	—
Ashwani Kumar Ajudhia Dass	17360	Fail 31	—	—
Tek Chand Thakur Hari Ram	17361	Fail 37	—	—
Manil Kumar Om Prakash	17362	Fail 12	—	—
Ashok Kumar Awasthi Bipat Rai Awasthi	17365	Pass 57	—	—
Poonam Sharma R. L. Sharma	17368	Fail 34	—	—
Dig Vijay Jyoti Lal	17369	Pass 60	—	—
Anshu Anand Sant Kumar	17370	Fail 36	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
S/Shri/Smt.				
Neelam Malhotra	17372	Fail	—	—
Shiv Lal Malhotra		36		
Surinder K. Sharma	17373	Pass	—	—
Bam Dev		51		
Krishan Lal Gupta	17374	Pass	—	—
Brij Lal Gupta		50		
Sunita Verma	17375	Fail	—	—
Man Chand		36		
Haresh Rana	17376	Fail	—	—
M. S. Rana		41		
Lal Singh	17377	Fail	—	—
Lt. Sohan Singh		32		
Girdhari Lal	17378	Fail	—	—
Parma Ram		37		
Karam Chand Saini	17379	Fail	—	—
P. N. Saini		35		
Prakash Chand	17380	Fail	—	—
Krishan Lal		41		
Saroj Thakur	17381	Fail	—	—
J. R. Thakur		37		
Jagdish Chund Gupta	17382	Fail	—	—
Dila Ram Gupta		37		
Chander Singh Thakur	17383	Fail	—	—
H. S. Thakur		34		
Shashi Kanta	17384	Fail	—	—
Nand Lal		32		
Satish Kumar	17386	Fail	—	—
Sada Ram		30		
Shalini Tomar	17387	Pass	—	—
B. S Tomar		50		
Dharminder Singh	17388	Fail	—	—
Partap Singh		34		
Sanjay Deshta	17389	Fail	—	—
B. R. Deshta		29		
Vijay Kumar	17390	Fail	—	—
Vas Dev		42		
Onkar Chand	17391	Pass	—	—
Jaswant Singh		55		
Madan Lal	17393	Fail	—	—
Tihru Ram		21		
Ratti Ram	17395	Fail	—	—
Nanku Ram		31		
Prit Lal Sharma	17396	Fail	—	—
Krishan Dyal		25		
Sartaj Singh Rathour	17398	Fail	—	—
J. S. Rathour		35		
Susheel Kumar Sharma	17399	Fail	—	—
Shankar Lal		27		
Dev Manjari	17400	Fail	—	—
Ravi Datta		29		
Ramji Dass	17401	Pass	—	—
Amin Chand		50		
Garib Dass	17402	Fail	—	—
Bangali Ram		41		
Babu Ram	17403	Fail	—	—
Prem Chand		36		
Rajesh Kumar	17404	Fail	—	—
Babu Ram		37		
Sudersan Kumar	17405	Fail	—	—
Jamna Dass		37		
Hari Ram	17406	Fail	—	—
Medu Ram		34		
Hads Raj Acharya	17407	Pass	—	—
Tek Ram Acharya		59		

1	2	3	4	5
<i>S/Shri/Smt.</i>				
Sanjav Kumar Kango	17408	Pass	—	—
Hem Raj Kango		60		
Shanti Lal Sharma	17410	Fail	—	—
Ram Lal Sharma		38		
Nand Lal Bhardwaj	17414	Pass	—	—
Daya Ram Bhardwaj		50		
Surjeet Singh Thakur	17416	Fail	—	—
K. P. Thakur		38		
Prakash Chand	17418	Fail	—	—
Ram Dhan		24		
Praveen Kumar Verma	17420	Fail	—	—
K. C. Verma		38		
Ramesh Kumar	17421	Fail	—	—
Sudan Singh		40		
Krishan Chand	17422	Fail	—	—
Pausu Ram		37		
Shobha Garg	17426	Fail	—	—
Bhagat Ram		25		
Kiran Chandel	17427	Fail	—	—
B. R. Bhardwaj		36		
Ram Saroop	17429	Pass	—	—
Jit Ram		50		
Rashdev Singh	17430	Fail	—	—
Karam Chand		28		
Raj Kumar Jishtu	17432	Fail	—	—
Jwala Dass		20		
Brij Lal	17435	Fail	—	—
Mithnu		27		
Hem Raj Bhupal	17436	Fail	—	—
Lekh Ram		30		
Dikka Singh Chauhan	17437	Fail	—	—
K. D. Chauhan		39		
Archana Kapoor	17439	Pass	—	—
Shiv Lal Kapoor		50		
Rajeev Kumar Saini	17442	Fail	—	—
S. S. Saini		39		
Sunder Lal	17443	Pass	—	—
Anokhi Ram		50		
Mahesh Nag	17444	Pass	—	—
Thakur Dass Nag		51		
Yogendra Mohan	17447	Fail	—	—
A. N. Agnihotri		25		
Ramesh Chander	17448	Fail	—	—
Jagdish Chander		40		
Harish Kumar Chauhan	17449	Fail	—	—
Paras Ram		32		
Monika Gupta	17451	Pass	—	—
Narain Dass		50		
Om Prabha Monga	17452	Pass	—	—
S. P. Mohindra		50		
Rita Prabhakar	17453	Fail	—	—
Lt. Harbans Lal		26		
Savita Gupta	17454	Fail	—	—
Amar Nath Gupta		35		
Sunita Verma	17455	Pass	—	—
Rattan Chand		53		
Sulochana Bhardwaj	17456	Pass	—	—
Sohan Singh		50		
Saroj Sachdeva	17457	Pass	—	—
K. L. Gakhar		51		
Kamlesh Kumari	17458	Fail	—	—
Rasila Ram		42		
Parveen Lata	17459	Fail	—	—
Mangat Ram		40		
Madhu Kumari	17460	Pass	—	—
Ram Parkash		51		
Naresh Kumar	17462	Fail	—	—
Budhi Chand		23		
Kamesh Kumari	17464	Fail	—	—
Behari Lal		35		

1	2	3	4	5
<i>S/Shri/Smt. :</i>				
Aruna Rana	17465	Fail	—	—
Himal Chand		34		
Ashwani Singh	17466	Pass	—	—
Piar Singh		52		
Narinder Kumar	17467	Pass	—	—
Thakur Dass		55		
Brinda Sharma	17468	Fail	—	—
Braham Dass		29		
Rameshwar Singh	17469	Fail	—	—
Durga Singh		31		
Parma Ram Kashyap	17470	Fail	—	—
Sutal Ram		36		
Bhag Singh	17472	Fail	—	—
Mangat Ram		16		
Kamlender Vaidya	17473	Fail	—	—
Lt. T. R. Vaidya		34		
Suresh Kumar	17474	Fail	—	—
Luder Singh		38		
Kuldeep Singh	17475	Fail	—	—
Karam Chand		37		
Kamlesh K. Patyal	17476	Fail	—	—
D. S. Patyal		32		
Desh Raj Sharma	17478	Fail	—	—
Bhagwan Dass		38		
Suresh Chand	17479	Pass	—	—
Bakshi Chand		69		
Bheem Kumar	17482	Fail	—	—
Shiv Charan		38		
Savita Sharma	17485	Fail	—	—
Rameshwar Lal		37		
Om Prakash Lakhanwal	17486	Fail	—	—
Puran Chand		33		
Kahan Chand Randhawa	17488	Fail	—	—
G. R. Randhawa		19		
Ashok Kumar	17489	Fail	—	—
Amin Chand		37		
Narinder Singh	17490	Fail	—	—
Shive Lal Jhouta		27		
Des Raj	17491	Fail	—	—
Lachhman Singh		32		
Yogita Bal	17492	Fail	—	—
Hardeep Singh		28		
Meenakshi Sapru	17493	Fail	—	—
Jawahar Lal Kaul		39		
L. R. Sharma	17496	Fail	—	—
Mehar Chand		35		
Brij Lal Bhardwaj	17497	Fail	—	—
Som Krishan		29		
Hoshiar Singh Thakur	17499	Fail	—	—
K. R. Thakur		32		
Nanak Chand	17502	Fail	—	—
Khalalu Ram		42		
Virender Chadha	17503	Fail	—	—
Chaman Lal		16		
Uma Kumari	17508	Fail	—	—
Hira Singh		28		
Nitika Brara Sharma	17509	Fail	—	—
S. C. Brara		43		
Gopal Dass Chowdhary	17511	Fail	—	—
Bishan Dass		17		
Onkar Singh	17513	Fail	—	—
Balwant Singh		37		
Shyam Lal Dhiman	17516	Fail	—	—
Sita Ram		27		
Prem Singh Gazta	17517	Pass	—	—
Mehar Singh Gazta		52		
Dev Raj Mehta	17518	Pass	—	—
Durga Ram Mehta		51		
Chandan Kumar	17520	Pass	—	—
Madan Singh		50		

1	2	3	4	5
S/Shri/Smt. :				
Laxman Singh	17521	Fail	—	—
Sannu Ram		28		
Shachi	17522	Fail	—	—
Keshav Narayan		18		
Surinder Singh Heer	17523	Fail	—	—
Puran Singh Heer		37		
Ashok Kumar	17524	Pass	—	—
Roshan Lal		62		
Bir Singh	17525	Fail	—	—
Gopi Ram		19		
Hari Ram Sharma	17528	Fail	—	—
Sukh Ram Sharma		36		
Indra Gupta	17529	Pass	Pass	—
R. L. Mahajan		51	56	
Subhash Chander	17530	Fail	—	—
Gauri Chand		36		
Ranjeet Kumar	17531	Fail	—	—
Khazana Ram		34		
Dev Raj Dhiman	17532	Fail	—	—
Chint Ram Dhiman		32		
Haru D. Vijay Awasthi	17533	Pass	—	—
K. C. Awasthi		53		
Ram Krishan	17536	Fail	—	—
Rama Nand		39		
Urgian Dolma	17537	Fail	—	—
Panchhi Ram		27		
Rattan Chand	17539	Fail	—	—
Dhanpat Raj		36		
Vikas Singh	17540	Pass	—	—
Issu Ram		50		
Virender K. Talwar	17541	Fail	—	—
Muni Lal Talwar		26		
Jagdish Singh Rana	17542	Fail	—	—
Bhagat Ram		33		
Rajinder Kumar	17543	Fail	—	—
Badri Parshad		30		
Brij Mohan	17544	Fail	—	—
Ram Saroop Sharma		24		
Shashi Bala	17545	Fail	—	—
Harimitter		22		
Neelam Verma	17551	Fail	—	—
Sher Singh		22		
Kamlesh Kumari	17552	Fail	—	—
Ganko Ram		21		
Devinder Parkash	17553	Fail	—	—
Datt Sharma		25		
Parkash Sharma	17554	Fail	—	—
Surat Ram		36		
Manjula Sharma	17555	Fail	—	—
G. S. Sharma		38		
Veena Gupta	17557	Fail	—	—
Bhoop Ram Gupta		34		
Harbans Lal Sharma	17558	Fail	—	—
Jagan Nath		34		
Guninder Sharma	17559	Fail	—	—
Kanshi Ram		39		
Kaushal Kumar Sharma	17560	Fail	—	—
P. P. Sharma		19		
Santosh Sharma	17561	Fail	—	—
Shriniwas Sharma		17		
Vijaya Chauhan	17562	Fail	—	—
M. R. Shankta		38		
Rama Kanwar	17563	Fail	—	—
Jit Singh Kanwar		31		
Ashok Kumar Sharma	17564	Fail	—	—
B. Prashad		28		
Balkrishnan Jaswal	17565	Fail	—	—
Mathru Ram		21		
Rajesh Kumar	17566	Pass	—	—
Govordhan Lal		51		

1	2	3	4	5
<i>S/Shri/Smt. :</i>				
Gjan Chand Sharma	17567	Pass	—	—
Dila Ram		50		
Neena Kumari	17568	Fail	—	—
Rattan Chand		37		
Kuldeep Singh Thakur	17569	Fail	—	—
Sher Singh Thakur		30		
Prakash Sankhyan	17570	Fail	—	—
S. S. Sankhyan		28		
Binder Singh Sambra	17572	Fail	—	—
Ram Rattan Sambra		35		
Shakuntla Sharma	17577	Fail	—	—
Ram Kishan Sharma		19		
Ruma Handa	17579	Fail	—	—
Sidhu Ram		18		
Kuldeep Chand	17580	Fail	—	—
Sant Ram		14		
Nikka Ram	17581	Fail	—	—
Hari Ram		25		
Vijay Keprate	17582	Fail	—	—
G. S. Chauhan		28		
Rama Nand Sharma	17583	Fail	—	—
Shiv Ram Sharma		21		
Kiran Kanta	17585	Fail	—	—
Amar Nath Sharma		32		
Hans Raj Thakur	17586	Fail	—	—
Gawanu Ram		28		
Mohan Lal Chandel	17587	Fail	—	—
K. R. Chandel		35		
Ajay Vashishat	17588	Fail	—	—
Omkar Nath		22		
Desh Raj	17592	Fail	—	—
Lashkari Ram		25		
Raj Kumari	17594	Fail	—	—
Bali Bhadar Goel		20		
Mangat Ram	17595	Fail	—	—
Phagnu Ram		13		
Vash Pal Singh	17597	Fail	—	—
Jagdish Singh		25		
Bakul	17598	Pass	—	—
D. S. Thakur		50		
Neeru Madaan	17599	Pass	—	—
Baldev Raj		52		
Baldev Krishan Soni	17602	Pass	—	—
S. K. Soni		50		
Karam Singh	17603	Fail	—	—
Narain Singh		20		
Chander Prabha	17604	Fail	—	—
P. S. Jishtu		35		
Suresh Kumari	17605	Fail	—	—
Bidhi Chand		22		
Shanti Parkash	17607	Fail	—	—
Brahma Nand		10		
Bhag Singh Bandan	17608	Fail	—	—
Sant Ram		31		
Surinder Prasad	17609	Pass	—	—
Mangat Ram		50		
Pawan Kumar	17610	Fail	—	—
Makholi Ram		30		
Vijay Nath Lath	17613	Pass	—	—
Hem Raj Lath		50		
Muneesh Gupta	17614	Fail	—	—
Satya Pal Gupta		26		
Meena Ram Rithwan	17615	Fail	—	—
C. D. Rithwan		22		
Sudhir Sharma	17616	Fail	—	—
D. C. Sharma		34		
Ramesh Chand	17617	Fail	—	—
Ranjit Singh		28		
Seema Marwah	17619	Fail	—	—
P. L. Soni		30		

1	2	3	4	5
S/Shri/Smt. :				
Bindra Devi	17620	Fail	—	—
Chuhru Ram		31		
Manohar Dhadwal	17622	Fail	—	—
M. C. Dhadwal		29		
Duni Chand	17625	Fail	—	—
Halman Sharma		17		
Prem Kumar	17626	Fail	—	—
Sukh Sain		35		
Roop Chand Malhotra	17628	Fail	—	—
Sher Singh		11		
Sushil Gautam	17629	Fail	—	—
Hem Chand Sharma		33		
Kuldeep K. Sharma	17631	Pass	—	—
Thakur Dass		52		
Sunil K. Kohli	17632	Fail	—	—
K. K. Kohli		32		
Santosh Kumar	17633	Pass	—	—
Amar Singh		55		
Kewal K. Kaushal	17634	Fail	—	—
Mangat Ram		37		
Uma Soni	17636	Fail	—	—
Krishan Lal		36		
Jagat Ram Kaushal	17640	Fail	—	—
Partap Chand		26		
Meena Kumari Verma	17641	Fail	—	—
Sudhesh Pal		27		
Saneh Lata	17642	Fail	—	—
Rup Singh		32		
Raksha Sharma	17643	Fail	—	—
M. L. Sharma		23		
Raj Kumari	17644	Fail	—	—
Jindu Ram Thakur		23		
Kusum Lata	17645	Fail	—	—
Yog Raj Malhotra		38		
Suman Bakshi	17646	Fail	—	—
S. D. S. Jaswal		37		
Mohinder Singh	17647	Fail	—	—
Kishan Singh		27		
Hem Raj Chaudhary	17649	Pass	—	—
Uttam Singh		51		
Roop Kumar	17650	Fail	—	—
Hans Raj		40		
Prem Lata Goel	17651	Fail	—	—
Kharate Ram		28		
Kanwar Singh Negi	17653	Fail	—	—
Chet Ram Negi		34		
Alok Chand Katoch	17654	Pass	—	—
K. S. Katoch		57		
Om Parkash Bhardwaj	17656	Fail	—	—
Shiv Kumar		32		
Yoginder Singh	17657	Fail	—	—
Devinder Singh		32		
Kusum Lata	17658	Fail	—	—
Roshan Lal		35		
Kumari Ravindra	17659	Fail	—	—
Mango Ram		22		
Ravi Kant Sharma	17660	Fail	—	—
J. D. Sharma		23		
Joginder Rao	17661	Fail	—	—
Roshan Lal		27		
Shashi Praba	17662	Pass	—	—
Manohar Lal		50		
Rakesh Pathak	17663	Phil	—	—
Jagat Ram		22		
Hiteshi	17664	Fail	—	—
R. K. Chauhan		39		
Vipender Lal Kalta	17665	Fail	—	—
P. L. Kalta		29		
Dinesh Kumar	17666	Pass	—	—
T. S. Chauhan		56		
Sushil Kumar	17667	Fail	—	—
Jagdish Chand		58		
Surinder Kaushal	17668	Pass	—	—
R. S. Kaundal		50		

1	2	3	4	5
<i>S/Shri; Smt. :</i>				
Bikram Singh Jaswal	17669	Fail	—	—
Nanak Singh		39		
Mauji Ram Heera	17670	Fail	—	—
Marchu Ram Heera		25		
Amarjit Singh Sandhu	17671	Pass	—	—
G. S. Sandhu		55		
Rajdev Rana	17672	Pass	—	—
Hukam Singh		60		
Anita Dhiman	17673	Pass	—	—
Avtar Singh		50		
Prem Dass Walia	17674	Fail	—	—
Salig Ram Walia		25		
Gopal Dass	17676	Fail	—	—
Gulzari Lal		31		
Bhag Singh	17677	Fail	—	—
Sunder Singh		38		
Rattan Lal	17678	Pass	—	—
Sant Ram		51		
Prabha Devi	17679	Fail	—	—
Shiv Ram		35		
Devinder Datt	17680	Fail	—	—
Shonkia Ram		20		
Amardeep Singh	17681	Fail	—	—
Baldev Singh		26		
Tarsem Singh	17682	Fail	—	—
Dharam Singh		23		
Devi Datt Joshi	17683	Fail	—	—
C. M. Joshi		30		
Milap Chand Lugal	17684	Fail	—	—
Kanshi Ram		33		
Rakesh Kumar	17685	Fail	—	—
Shankar Dass		37		
Janak Raj	17686	Fail	—	—
Rameshwar Dass		37		
Uttam Singh	17691	Fail	—	—
Mehar Singh		34		
Sanjeev Kumar	17692	Fail	—	—
Rattan Chand		41		
Varinder Singh	17693	Fail	—	—
Nasib Singh		38		
Kamlesh Kumari	17695	Fail	—	—
Himmant Singh		22		
Amreek Singh	17696	Fail	—	—
Nagar Dev		35		
Manoj Kumar	17697	Fail	—	—
Narain Dass		30		
Amit Kumar	17698	Fail	—	—
Shayam Lal Gupta		39		
Khajan Chand	17699	Fail	—	—
Parma Ram		27		
Anil Thakur	17700	Fail	—	—
Durga Singh		27		
Chander Kant	17703	Fail	—	—
Gain Chand		37		
Ramdhan Sankhyan	17705	Fail	—	—
Hariman		31		
Kanshi Ram Garg	17706	Fail	—	—
Ram Chand		38		
Harnam Singh	17707	Fail	—	—
Tabu Ram		25		
Krishan Chand	17708	Fail	—	—
Mohan Ram		38		
Salochna Sharma	17710	Fail	—	—
Raj Ram Sharma		28		
Shanti Sarup Sharma	17711	Fail	—	—
P. D. Sharma		36		
Baldev Dhiman	17712	Fail	—	—
Munshi Ram		38		
Milkh Raj Bains	17713	Fail	—	—
Bhagat Ram		28		
Romesh Chand	17714	Fail	—	—
Sewa Ram		26		
Ram Chand Tabyal	17715	Fail	—	—
Dass Ram		32		
Satish Kumar Khanna	17716	Pass	—	—
I. P. Khanna		50		

1	2	3	4	5
S/Shri/Smt. :				
Chander Pal	17717	Pass	—	—
Bahadur Singh		50		
Kamal Parkash Sehgal	17718	Fail	—	—
Bansi Ram Sehgal		37		
Seema Rana	17720	Pass	—	—
Harnarayan Singh		50		
Bhavna Tanwar	17724	Fail	—	—
K. Upendra Singh		29		
Shanta Verma	17725	Fail	—	—
Rati Ram Verma		42		
Saroj Bala Rathore	17726	Pass	—	—
Sohan Singh Rawat		50		
Manorma Negi	17727	Fail	—	—
Kehar Singh Negi		38		
Bharat Singh Kashyap	17728	Fail	—	—
B. R. Kashyap		30		
Shashji Bala Sharma	17729	Fail	—	—
Duni Chand Sharma		22		
Mridula Kharwara	17730	Fail	—	—
Ranjit Singh		34		
Inder Singh	17731	Fail	—	—
Kaila Ram		26		
Sunita Sanjeev Sunta	17736	Fail	—	—
Chitranshan Dass		24		
Narinder Singh Rana	17737	Fail	—	—
Ram Singh Rana		5		
Samrita Dogra	17738	Fail	—	—
G. S. Rana		37		
Jagan Nath Thakur	17740	Fail	—	—
Sant Ram		15		
Kundan Lal	17741	Pass	—	—
Brahm Dass		55		
Tejinder Lal	17742	Fail	—	—
Bhuru Ram		32		
Ramesh Kumar	17746	Fail	—	—
Brahman Dutt		29		
Ashwani Kumar	17749	Fail	—	—
Parma Nand		37		
Mithlesh Kumari	17751	Pass	—	—
Puran Chand		50		
Sardari Lal Changra	17752	Fail	—	—
Tulsi Ram		38		
Karam Chand	17753	Fail	—	—
Lasho Ram		26		
Sunita Singh	17754	Fail	—	—
Prithvi Chand		40		
Nishi Kant Sharma	17756	Fail	—	—
S. D. Sharma		20		
Suresh Thakur	17757	Fail	—	—
Prem Singh Thakur		32		
Bansi Ram Verma	17758	Fail	—	—
Dandu Ram		36		
Madhu Verma	17759	Fail	—	—
Prem Singh Verma		35		
Balbir Singh Verma	17761	Fail	—	—
Achar Singh		30		
Savitri Sharma	17762	Fail	—	—
Runka Ram		23		
Swaroop K. Bhardwaj	17764	Pass	—	—
Daulat Ram		52		
Anil Kumar	17766	Fail	—	—
Prem Chand		24		
Bhag Chand Thakur	17767	Fail	—	—
P. R. Thakur		25		
Rama Chauhan	17768	Fail	—	—
B. S. Chauhan		28		
Yudhishter Kumar	17770	Fail	—	—
Mitter Dev		9		
Manju Jaryal	17771	Fail	—	—
Anam Singh Naryal		29		
Shreekala Vij	17774	Fail	—	—
Giridhar Mimani		36		
Kamlesh Pathak	17775	Fail	—	—
Hakim Raj Sharma		26		
Tulsi Ram Thakur	17778	Fail	—	—
Hazara Ram		11		

1	2	3	4	5
S/Sir/Smt. :				
Mukhtiyar Chand	17779	Fail	—	—
Sih Ram		24		
Rup Chand	17780	Fail	—	—
Rangilu Ram		33		
Narinder Nath Dhiman	17781	Fail	—	—
Lal Dass Dhiman		20		
Vidya Sagar Thakur	17783	Fail	—	—
Mahant Ram		8		
Bharti Kapoor	17784	Fail	—	—
Mahender Kapoor		28		
Rachna Gupta	17785	Fail	—	—
Om Prakash		36		
Dava Ram	17786	Fail	—	—
Lachhamu Ram		23		
Devendra Kumar	17787	Fail	—	—
Kirpa Ram		23		
Rajender Kumar	17788	Fail	—	—
Dharmvir Kashyap		27		
Joginder Kumar	17789	Fail	—	—
Sarwan Kumar		37		
Pawan Kumar	17791	Fail	—	—
L. R. Sharma		33		
Arjun Singh	17794	Fail	—	—
Julfi Ram		17		
Prem Pal Thakur	17795	Fail	—	—
Pratap Singh		24		
Parnita Thakur	17796	Fail	—	—
G. C. Thakur		33		
Nisha Gupta	17797	Pass	—	—
Lal Chand Gupta		56		
Harnam Singh Rana	17798	Fail	—	—
Munshi Ram Rana		20		
Ganga Negi	17800	Fail	—	—
K. R. Negi		17		
Poonam Sharma	17801	Fail	—	—
B. D. Sharma		23		
Krishna Sharma	17802	Fail	—	—
Jagdish Chand		28		
Chander Kanta	17803	Fail	—	—
Ranbir Singh		32		
Randhir S. Rathour	17804	Fail	—	—
Mansukh Rathour		28		
Rajinder Singh	17805	Fail	—	—
Lachman Singh		25		
Anita Gupta	17807	Fail	—	—
Mansa Ram Gupta		31		
Tanzin Angmo	17808	Fail	—	—
Paljor Wapa		26		
Tashi Angmo	17809	Fail	—	—
Paljore		20		
Fateh Singh Thakur	17810	Fail	—	—
Pari Dutt		34		
Almi Thakur	17811	Fail	—	—
Atma Ram		27		
Tajender Singh	17812	Pass	—	—
M. S. Kutleria		53		
Balbir Singh	17814	Pass	—	—
Sher Singh		50		
Balbir Singh	17815	Fail	—	—
Kishor Chand		24		
Pardeep Kumar	17816	Pass	—	—
Lobhi Ram		50		
Jagdev Singh	17817	Pass	—	—
Piar Singh		52		
Chander Kala	17820	Fail	—	—
S. R. Sahni		20		
Monika Gupta	17821	Fail	—	—
G. P. Gupta		28		
Sanjay Kumar	17824	Fail	—	—
Het Ram		37		
Shashi Pal	17825	Fail	—	—
Kanshi Ram		35		
Jagdish Chand	17826	Fail	—	—
Bhuri Singh		33		

1	2	3	4	5
<i>S/Shri/Smt. :</i>				
Neelam Sharma	17828	Fail	—	—
Babu Ram Sharma		23		
Nirmal Devi Thakur	17829	Pass	—	—
Hari Chand		50		
Sushil Kumar Sharma	17830	Fail	—	—
Praja Ram		38		
Jagdish Singh	17831	Fail	—	—
Dhurgo Ram		35		
Krishan Lal	17832	Fail	—	—
Nagin Chand		26		
Manorma Gautam	17834	Fail	—	—
Krishan Dass		13		
Sukh Dev	17836	Fail	—	—
Lekh Ram		36		
Meena Kumari	17837	Fail	—	—
Chaudhari Ram		24		
Kiran Kumari	17838	Fail	—	—
Chaman Lal		25		
Ramesh Chand	17839	Fail	—	—
Thakur Dass		38		
Vipin Kumar	17840	Pass	—	—
Bishan Dass		50		
Aruna Khanna	17841	Pass	—	—
Surinder Nath		50		
Punam Chaudhary	17842	Pass	—	—
Kuldip Chand		51		
Yadvender Kumar	17843	Pass	—	—
Narain Dass		50		
Ravi Kapoor	17844	Fail	—	—
Gulab Singh		23		
Tilak Raj	17845	Fail	—	—
Ram Pal		26		
Brahama Nand	17846	Fail	—	—
S. Ghasitu Ram		22		
Mohan Singh	17847	Fail	—	—
Khembu Ram		30		
Lokesh Parikh	17848	Fail	—	—
Prabhu Dayal		25		
Vidya Sagar Dhigta	17849	Fail	—	—
Mohan Lal		32		
Tarvinder Kaur	17850	Pass	—	—
Gurdev Singh		62		
Malkeet Singh	17851	Fail	—	—
Paras Ram		38		
Harish Kumar	17852	Fail	—	—
Ram Kishore		20		
Pritam Chand Sandhu	17853	Fail	—	—
Nikku Ram		29		
Vinod Dogra	17855	Fail	—	—
Baldev Singh		36		
Kailash Chand	17856	Fail	—	—
Rama Nand		20		
Neena Kumari	17857	Fail	—	—
Bahadur Singh		22		
Dev Raj	17861	Pass	—	—
Nanak Chand		50		
Anil Kumar	12862	Fail	—	—
Lekh Ram		39		
Devi Chand	17863	Fail	—	—
Mehar Chand		29		
Rajesh Patial	17864	Fail	—	—
Jagdish Ram		34		
Punam Rana	17865	Fail	—	—
K. K. Kapahi		34		
Raghuvir Singh	17866	Fail	—	—
Rasil Chand		36		
Ajay Kumar Sharma	17867	Fail	—	—
Sadhu Ram		25		
Pushpinder Malik	17870	Fail	—	—
Ram Singh		29		
Govind Ram Thakur	17871	Fail	—	—
Franti Ram Thakur		27		
Amar Dev Angiras	17873	Fail	—	—
Anant Ram		23		
Purshottam Chand	17875	Fail	—	—
Pala Ram		39		
Asha Rani	17876	Fail	—	—
Kishan Chand		24		

1	2	3	4	5
S/Shri Smt. :				
Joginder Singh	17880	Fail	—	—
Om Prakash		34		
Surender Kumar	17882	Fail	—	—
Bali Ram		20		
Amar Jit	17885	Fail	—	—
Dhani Ram		21		
Rajendra Singh	17887	Fail	—	—
Jiwan Singh		27		
Bhal Singh Chandel	17888	Fail	—	—
Ram Krishan Negi		25		
Ramesh Chaudhary	17889	Fail	—	—
G. L. Chaudhary		22		
Punam Pandey	17890	Fail	—	—
R. C. Tiwari		29		
Paras Ram Chauhan	17891	Fail	—	—
Mangat Ram		17		
Deepa Kalra	17892	Fail	—	—
Sohan Lal		23		
Kamlesh Kumari	17893	Fail	—	—
Rup Singh		15		
Sunil Kumar Samma	17894	Fail	—	—
Roshan Lal Samma		33		
Vijay Kumar	17895	Fail	—	—
Hazari Lal		19		
Lalita Rawat	17896	Fail	—	—
Mehar Chand		35		
Sansar Chand	17899	Fail	—	—
Dalipa Ram		32		
Bhim Singh Rana	17901	Fail	—	—
Sudama Ram		31		
Satish Kumar	17905	Fail	—	—
Sher Singh		32		
Daya Ram	17910	Fail	—	—
Tulsi Ram		26		
Sarita Sharma	17911	Fail	—	—
Nagender Lal		34		
Surinder Singh	17913	Pass	—	—
Z. R. Mankotia		50		
Trilochan Singh	17915	Fail	—	—
Amar Singh		38		
Neelam Verma	17916	Pass	—	—
Baldev Raj Suri		50		
Usha Rani	17918	Pass	—	—
B. R. Sharma		51		
Jasomati Sharma	17924	Fail	—	—
Chet Ram		34		
Praven Kumar Jhamb	17928	Fail	—	—
Krishan Lal Jhamb		34		
Krishan Paul	17922	Fail	—	—
Mahant Ram		21		
Munish Kamal	17930	Fail	—	—
T. R. Kamal		21		
Chander Shekhar	17931	Fail	—	—
Om Prakash		34		
Gopal Singh Jaswal	17933	Fail	—	—
Dhara Singh		38		
Rattan Chand Thakur	17934	Fail	—	—
Tek Chand		22		
Prem Chand Chaudhary	17939	Fail	—	—
Kartar Chand		26		
Uma Dutt Vashist	17940	Pass	—	—
Paras Ram Vashist		64		
Anokhi Ram Kashyap	17941	Fail	—	—
Budhi Ram		38		
Parkash Chand	17943	Fail	—	—
Kahan Singh		10		
Satish K. Chaudhary	17944	Fail	—	—
P. R. Chaudhary		38		
Som Lal	17945	Pass	—	—
Lekh Raj		51		
Dharam Singh Minhas	17946	Fail	—	—
Jalu Ram		27		
Ruchi Ramesh	17948	Fail	—	—
P. R. Ramesh		21		
Ashok Kumar	17950	Pass	—	—
Ishwar Dass		53		

1	2	3	4	5
Sh. Rajinder Kumar	17951	Pass	—	—
Sh. Jagdish Chand		51		
Sh. Poonam Kumari	17952	Pass	—	—
Sh. Kashmir Singh		52		
Sh. Kusum Sharma	17954	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sukh Raj Sharma		7		
Tara Chauhan	17956	Fail	—	—
Sh. Amar Singh		34		
Anita Rana	17957	Pass	—	—
Sh. J. C. Rana		54		
Ravi Parakash Sharma	17958	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bashmber Datt		29		
Suman Singh Katwal	17959	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kehar Singh		25		
Suresh Kumar Gautam	17960	Fail	—	—
Sh. Beli Ram Gautam		26		
Satya Prakash Sharma	17961	Fail	—	—
Sh. Tankeshwar Ram		42		
Nirmala Sharma	17963	Fail	—	—
SS. Braham Datt		26		
Om Prakash Sharma	17964	Fail	—	—
Sh. Durga Dass		36		
Ram Bhaj	17965	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hari Singh		37		
Ajit Kumar Sharma	17966	Fail	—	—
Sh. Thenu Ram Sharma		34		
Suresh Kumar	17967	Fail	—	—
Sh. Shyam Lal		30		
Reena Saini	17968	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kali Dass Saini		21		
Neelam Kumari	17969	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jasu Ram		34		
Depak Nagari	17970	Fail	—	—
Sh. D. N. Nagari		38		
Mamta Kumari	17971	Fail	—	—
Sh. Narender Mohan		26		
Kamal Singh	17972	Fail	—	—
Sh. Loungu Ram		36		
Kusum Kapoor	17974	Pass	—	—
Sh. Tek Chand Bisth		51		
Surinder Singh	17975	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lal Chand		29		
Devender Kumar	17976	Fail	—	—
Sh. Harnam Singh		37		
Parkash Chand	17977	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lachhman Dass		39		
Manoj Kumar Sharma	17978	Fail	—	—
Sh. Nek Ram Sharma		32		
Pritam Singh Thakur	17979	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Saran Thakur		50		
Suneel Kumar	17980	Pass	—	—
Sh. Param Dev Saini		53		
Ramesh Kumar	17981	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ramu		31		
Punjab Singh Rana	17983	Pass	—	—
Sh. Mangat Ram Rana		58		
Tulsi Ram Shandil	17984	Fail	—	—
Sh. M. R. Shandil		17		
Om Parkash Sharma	17985	Fail	—	—
Sh. Fitu Ram Sharma		23		
Puran Chand	17989	Fail	—	—
Sh. Tulsi Ram		19		
Raj Kumar	17990	Fail	—	—
Sh. Chaman Prakash		38		
Ram Paul	17991	Fail	—	—
Sh. Diwan Chand		30		
Satya Devi	17992	Fail	—	—
Sh. Shankar Dutt		25		
Parbodh Thakur	17993	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kulwant Singh		37		
Ramesh Chander	17997	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lachhman Dass		17		
Mastan Singh	17998	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sa'ig Ram		20		
Gita Ram Kashyap	17999	Fail	—	—
Sh. N. R. Kashyap		25		
Madan Gopal Patyal	18000	Fail	—	—
Sh. Shankar Lal		33		

1	2	3	4	5
Binti Manuja	18005	Fail	—	—
Sh. D. N. Mehra		38		
Naresh Kumar Sharma	18006	Fail	—	—
Sh. Govind Ram		19		
Raj Nath Sharma	18008	Fail	—	—
Sh. Brahma Nand		37		
Mohan Lal Dhiman	18009	Fail	—	—
Sh. Panju Ram		30		
Jagat Mohan Singh	18010	Fail	—	—
Sh. Babu Ram		32		
Abhay Singh Negi	18011	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dorjai Negi		38		
P. L. Sharma	18014	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Dass Sharma		50		
Roshan Lal	18015	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ghirthoo Ram		29		
Bishan Swaroop	18019	Fail	—	—
Sh. Nek Ram		33		
Bhagi Rath Dogra	18020	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kanshi Ram		23		
Brikam Singh	18021	Fail	—	—
Sh. Mangat Ram		31		
Nand Lal	18022	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sunder Ram		29		
Suneel Dutt Sharma	18023	Fail	—	—
Sh. Luxman Dutt		27		
Hem Dutt Sharma	18024	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dandu Ram		13		
Saroj Kumari Sharma	18025	Fail	—	—
Sh. Mathura Dass		5		
Gian Chand	18026	Fail	—	—
Sh. Phinu Ram		37		
Kamal Kishore	18027	Fail	—	—
Sh. Shanker Dass		35		
Ram Krishan	18029	Fail	—	—
Sh. Prabhu Ram		31		
Vijay Kumar	18031	Pass	—	—
Sh. Jagan Nath		50		
Sukh Lal	18032	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jodha Ram		25		
Surinder Paul	18035	Fail	—	—
Sh. Roop Chand		27		
Rakesh Kumar Chauhan	18040	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gulab Singh		13		
Nirmal Kumar	18042	Pass	—	—
Sh. Bhawani Shankar		50		
Rama Sharma	18043	Fail	—	—
Sh. H. D. Mehta		27		
Lal Singh Patial	18044	Fail	—	—
Sh. Mahant Ram		16		
Pratap Chand	18046	Fail	—	—
Sh. Braham Dass		19		
Chaman Lal Kalja	18047	Fail	—	—
Sh. Damodar Dass		24		
Ramesh Chand	18048	Fail	—	—
Sh. Amar Nath		38		
Rajinder Singh	18049	Pass	—	—
Sh. Dila Ram		60		
Raj Kumar	18050	Pass	—	—
Sh. Kanshi Ram		50		
Ram Sharma	18053	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rikhi Ram Sharma		18		
Parkasho Devi	18054	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhandari Ram		32		
Vinod Kumar Sharma	18055	Fail	—	—
Sh. Niranjan Lal		31		
Harbans Lal	18056	Fail	—	—
Sh. Relu Ram		36		
Jaswant Singh	18058	Pass	—	—
Sh. Shyam Lal		56		
Kailash Katoch	18059	Pass	—	—
Sh. Amar Chand		51		
Gopal Singh Saini	18060	Pass	—	—
Sh. Bardu Ram Saini		50		
Durga Parasad Sharma	18063	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhagat Ram		33		

1	2	3	4	5
Sonia Kaul	18066	Pass	—	—
Sh. J. L. Sharma		57		
Tanzin Chhota Negi	18067	Pass	—	—
Sh. C. G. Chen Negi		51		
Vijay Nath Lath	18068	Pass	—	—
Sh. Hem Raj Lath		51		
Rakesh Sharma	18069	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gian Chand		39		
Nasib Singh	18070	Fail	—	—
Sh. Prem Singh		39		
Nirmal Chauhan	18072	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sukh Ram Chauhan		13		
Manoj Mahajan	18073	Pass	—	—
Sh. Anant Ram		60		
Ranvir Singh Rathor	18074	Pass	—	—
Sh. Gokal Chand		51		
Rajesh Kapatia	18075	Fail	—	—
Sh. Prakash Chand		24		
Ran Singh	18078	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gopal Dass		22		
Dharam Paul	18079	Fail	—	—
Sh. Inder Singh		38		
Joginder Paul	18080	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sukh Ram		26		
Ram Chand	18082	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kashmir Singh		30		
Dinesh Kumar Misra	18083	Fail	—	—
Sh. N. R. Misra		39		
Raj Kumar	18084	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ramji Dass		59		
Vikram Singh Kapil	18085	Pass	—	—
Sh. Manohar Lal		54		
Mangat Ram Dogra	18086	Pass	—	—
Sh. B. R. Dogra		57		
Sudarashan Kumar	18087	Pass	—	—
Sh. Bakhshi Ram		50		
Ramesh Kumar	18088	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhuri Singh		33		
Suman Kumar	18089	Fail	—	—
Sh. Prabh Dyal		39		
Sanjay Kumar Sharma	18092	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rup Lal Sharma		39		
Mast Ram	18093	Fail	—	—
Sh. Padam Singh		39		
Yadvinder Singh	18094	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hukam Singh		32		
Naresh Kumar Sharma	18095	Fail	—	—
Sh. Saran Dass		39		
Lekh Raj	18096	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hira Singh		23		
Yadvinder Kumar	18098	Fail	—	—
Sh. Chet Ram		36		
Mahipal Sharma	18099	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lekh Raj Sharma		37		
Harbans Lal Kapoor	18100	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhup Singh		39		
Mohinder Kumar	18101	Fail	—	—
Sh. Banku Ram		35		
Ashok Kumar	18103	Pass	—	—
Sh. Amar Jit		53		
Kavita Kapoor	18105	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lekh Ram Vaidya		29		
Veena Vaidya	18106	Fail	—	—
Sh. D. R. Sharma		22		
Satya Pal Gautam	18111	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rikhi Ram		39		
Rakesh Bhardwaj	18112	Fail	—	—
Sh. Salig Ram		39		
Dharam Singh Thakur	18113	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lal Singh Thakur		34		
Hem Raj Verma	18114	Fail	—	—
Sh. Balak Ram Verma		17		
Vijay Kumar	18115	Fail	—	—
Sh. Devi Rup		12		
Surander Kumari Negi	18116	Fail	—	—
Sh. Paras Ram Negi		39		
Raj Kumar Sharma	18117	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bakshi Ram		31		

1	2	3	4	5
Jaishi Ram	18118	Fail	—	—
Sh. Nanak Chand		19		
Rikhi Chand Bandhan	18120	Fail	—	—
Sh. Pala Ram		26		
Kiran Bala	18124	Fail	—	—
Ram Paul		32		
Pratima Kapoor	18128	Fail	—	—
Sh. Prithvi Lal		41		
Balwant Singh Jinta	18131	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gulab Singh		34		
Chhajju Ram	18133	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kishan Chand		25		
Rajeev Sharma	18138	Fail	—	—
Sh. M. R. Sharma		32		
Kam Raj	18139	Fail	—	—
Sh. Krishan Lal		44		
Vias Binder	18140	Pass	—	—
Sh. Chandu Ram		50		
Manju Lata	18141	Pass	—	—
Sh. Niranjan Singh		53		
Pradeep Sharma	18142	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ved Prakash		55		
Sneh Lata	18143	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dina Nath		39		
Prem Chand	18148	Fail	—	—
Sh. Devi Chand		27		
Chand Kishore	18149	Fail	—	—
Sh. Krishan Lal		26		
Kamlesh Kumar Gupta	18150	Pass	—	—
Sh. Parma Nand		56		
Khem Chand Chauhan	18151	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ishwar Dass		34		
B. R. Rana	18152	Pass	—	—
Sh. S. R. Rana		51		
Gian Chand Sharma	18153	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sita Ram Sharma		25		
Anita Singh	18154	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bihari Lal		38		
Madhu Sharma	18155	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagjit Lal Sharma		33		
Amrita	18159	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Krishan Gupta		53		
Upinder Singh	18163	Pass	—	—
Sh. Raghu Nath Singh		51		
Prakash Chand	18167	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhagwan Dass		16		
Naresh Kumar	18168	Fail	—	—
Sh. Thakur Dass		39		
Shashi Kumar	18169	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hoshier Singh		41		
Sudarshan Singh	18170	Pass	—	—
Sh. Dishan Singh		51		
Om Parkash Sharma	18171	Fail	—	—
Sh. Fithu Ram		31		
Narayan Singh	18173	Fail	—	—
Sh. Raphael Singh		39		
Tara Chand	18174	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kanshi Ram		31		
Inderjeet Singh	18176	Pass	—	—
Sh. Dile Ram		68		
Parkash Saini	18177	Pass	—	—
Sh. Gujjar Mal		63		
Harish Chandra Joshi	18178	Fail	—	—
Sh. Daya Ram		37		
Neelam Kaushal	18179	Pass	—	—
Sh. M. K. Marria		59		
Yash Pal Singh	18180	Fail	—	—
Sh. Amrit Lal		41		
Rajinder Kumar	18181	Pass	—	—
Sh. Nathu Ram		51		
Surinder Singh	18185	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gulab Singh		27		
Anil Chandel	18186	Fail	—	—
Sh. Wattan Singh		36		
Kamal Kishore	18187	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rajinder Suman		29		
Rattan Chand	18188	Pass	—	—
Sh. Beli Ram Chandra		50		

1	2	3	4	5
Pradeep Kumar	18191	Pass	—	—
Sh. Prakash Chand		59		
Raj Kumar	18194	Pass	—	—
Sh. Amar Nath		51		
Dharam Paul	18195	Pass	—	—
Sh. Paras Ram		54		
Raj Kumar Singh	18196	Pass	—	—
Sh. Nasib Singh		56		
Nagender Singh	18198	Pass	—	—
Tek Chand		50		
Krishan Kumar	18200	Pass	—	—
Sh. Parma Ram		50		
B. R. Rana	18201	Fail	—	—
Sh. Givaru Ram Rana		27		
Hari Ram Sharma	18204	Pass	—	—
Sh. Shiv Ram		51		
Rajender Chauhan	18205	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ujager Singh		57		
Sanjeev Modgil	18207	Pass	—	—
Sh. Rattan Lal		55		
Paras Ram Chauhan	18208	Pass	—	—
Sh. Kehar Singh		55		
Ravindra Kumar	18210	Pass	—	—
Sh. Atma Ram		50		
Tejinder Singh	18211	Fail	—	—
Sh. Roop Singh		39		
Nek Ram Sharma	18212	Fail	—	—
Sh. Purvia Ram		42		
Ramesh Kumar	18213	Fail	—	—
Sh. Daya Ram		39		
Nanak Chand	18216	Pass	—	—
Sh. Prabha Ram Sharma		50		
Kuldeep Singh	18217	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Chand		50		
Purshotam Dass	18218	Pass	—	—
Sh. Jai Ram		54		
Chander Shekhar	18219	Fail	—	—
Sh. Amar Nath		43		
Nand Lal	18223	Pass	—	—
Sh. Paras Ram		55		
Sanjay Kumar	18225	Fail	—	—
Sh. Mahender Paul		39		
Bhim Singh Thakur	18226	Pass	—	—
Sh. C. R. Thakur		55		
Pravin Kumar Gupta	18227	Pass	—	—
Sh. Bansi Lal		60		
Kundan Singh Rana	18231	Pass	—	—
Sh. Mohar Singh		59		
Surender Kumar	18232	Pass	—	—
Sh. Murat Singh		50		
Ramesh Kumar Sharma	18233	Pass	—	—
Sh. Kanshi Ram Sharma		50		
Lalit Kumar	18234	Pass	—	—
Sh. Shankar Lal		57		
Inder Singh	18235	Pass	—	—
Sh. Nokhu Ram		58		
Giri Raj Sharma	18236	Fail	—	—
Sh. Yad Ram Sharma		33		
Anusuya Prasad	18237	Fail	—	—
Sh. Vachaspati Kul		29		
Vidya Sagar Patial	18238	Fail	—	—
Sh. Baysi Ram		43		
Vidye Sagar Sharma	18239	Fail	—	—
Sh. Nathu Ram		31		
Amar Nath	18242	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jiwanu Ram		15		
Surinder Kaur	18245	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sewa Singh		29		
Sohan Lal Gupta	18246	Pass	—	—
Sh. Kheem Chand		52		
Prem Chand	18247	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ratti Ram		53		
Manoj Kumar Sharma	18249	Pass	—	—
Sh. Narsi Ram		61		
Ram Swaroop Verma	18251	Pass	—	—
Sh. Mast Ram		52		

1	2	3	4	5
Param Dev Badola	18255	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Prasad		50		
Narinder Sharma	18256	Pass	—	—
Sh. H. C. Sharma		90		
Alpa Malik	18258	Pass	—	—
Sh. Inderjeet Malik		51		
Shashi Bharti	18260	Fail	—	—
Sh. B. C. Bharti		19		
Om Prakash Sharma	18263	Pass	—	—
Sh. Pali Ram Sharma		50		
Bhag Singh	18265	Fail	—	—
Sh. Roop Singh		32		
Des Raj Pathania	18266	Pass	—	—
Sh. Kehar Singh		50		
Ashok Kumar Sharma	18267	Fail	—	—
Sh. Shri Ram Sharma		35		
Kartar Singh	18268	Pass	—	—
Sh. Jai Singh		50		
Parshotam Dass	18269	Fail	—	—
Sh. Nathu Ram		21		
Kailash Chand Pal	18270	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagdish Chand		38		
Dharam Vir	18271	Fail	—	—
Sh. Punnu Ram		39		
Bhupender Gupta	18272	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kamleshwar Gupta		38		
Vijay Chander Sharma	18273	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ram Pal Sharma		36		
Sunil Kumar Pal	18274	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagdish Chand		43		
Sohan Lal	18275	Pass	—	—
Sh. Daya Ram		52		
Madan Lal Sharma	18277	Pass	—	—
Sh. Prabhu Dass		52		
Kanta Kondal	18278	Pass	—	—
Sh. Amar Singh		51		
Pushpa Sharma	18279	Pass	—	—
Sh. Chet Ram Sharma		50		
Prem Lal Sharma	18280	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhagwan Ram		24		
Jagjeet Singh Bansal	18281	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bangali Ram		32		
Lal Singh Chauhan	18282	Fail	—	—
Sh. Durga Singh		35		
Sarojini Bansal	18283	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Sukh		50		
Sangita Gupta	18284	Pass	—	—
Sh. K. K. Gupta		54		
Prem Lal Sharma	18286	Pass	—	—
Sh. Mohla Ram		58		
Rani Nath Kalia	18287	Fail	—	—
Sh. Chhaju Ram		30		
Meena Kumari	18288	Pass	—	—
Sh. Sali Ram Verma		50		
Yashant Singh	18289	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ran Singh		50		
Baldev Dass Rattan	18290	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bansi Ram Rattan		32		
Kusum Dewan	18296	Pass	—	—
Sh. Harbhagwan Dass		50		
Harbans Kaur	18298	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagat Singh		51		
Indu Bala	18299	Fail	—	—
Sh. Amar Nath Sharma		29		
Neelam	18300	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ram Paul Singh		33		
Gurvinder Pal Singh	18301	Pass	—	—
Sh. Kishan Chand		52		
Ajay Sharma	18303	Pass	—	—
Sh. Amar Nath		55		
Prem Singh	18304	Pass	—	—
Sh. P. Ram		50		
Ravi Kumar Vaid	18305	Fail	—	—
Sh. Shyam Lal Vaid		39		
Ashwani Kumar	18306	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dina Nath		39		
Amar Chand Jaggi	18307	Fail	—	—
Sh. Chaudhari Ram		39		

1	2	3	4	5
Ramesh Kumar	18308	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rikhi Ram		14		
Shared Kumar Sharma	18309	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ram Narth		33		
Renu Suman	18310	Pass	—	—
Sh. S. P. Bhardwaj		50		
Roop Singh Thakur	18311	Fail	—	—
Sh. Angrup Dorje		37		
Sudesh Sharma	18313	Fail	—	—
Sh. Parmeshwari Dass		42		
Necra Mahajan	18314	Pass	—	—
Sh. Roshan Lal Gupta		59		
Sulakshna Atttri	18315	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagir Singh		42		
Sikander Singh	18317	Pass	—	—
Sh. Harbhajan Singh		58		
Om Parkash Vates	18318	Pass	—	—
Sh. Rattan Chand		53		
Charanjit Singh	18319	Fail	—	—
Sh. Shesh Ram		16		
Lekh Raj	18320	Fail	—	—
Sh. Biri Singh		38		
Tara Chand Sharma	18321	Fail	—	—
Sh. Paras Ram Sharma		39		
Kashmiri Lal	18322	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagat Ram		29		
Abha Peter	18323	Fail	—	—
Sh. A. K. Narru		30		
Meenu Sood	18324	Fail	—	—
Sh. Puran Chand Sood		36		
Ajay Singh	18325	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rajinder Singh		30		
Kalyan Singh	18331	Pass	—	—
Sh. Lakhu Ram		51		
Seema Kaul	18332	Pass	—	—
Sh. J. N. Kaul		50		
Vasu Dev Sharma	18334	Fail	—	—
Sh. Krishan Dutt		3		
Hardev Singh Kanwar	18335	Pass	—	—
Sh. Shakti Chand		50		
Suresh Kumar	18336	Pass	—	—
Sh. Gian Chand		50		
Shakuntla Kanwar	18337	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gian Chand Rawat		33		
Suresh Kumari Sharma	18338	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bali Ram Sharma		29		
Durga Singh Thakur	18340	Pass	—	—
Sh. Dile Ram Thakur		53		
Govind Ram Thakur	18341	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lakhu Ram		39		
Girdhari Lal Sharma	18342	Pass	—	—
Sh. Dharam Dass		58		
Maya Kumari	18343	Pass	—	—
Sh. Paras Ram Chauhan		52		
Vibhadra Singh Tegta	18344	Fail	—	—
Sh. B. D. Tegta		39		
Anjali Kapoor	18345	Pass	—	—
Sh. Laxaman Dass		50		
Vijay Kumar	18346	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sita Ram		22		
Jayant Kumar Sharma	18351	Fail	—	—
Sh. Amba Dutt		40		
Lokinder Singh	18352	Fail	—	—
Sh. S. N. Chauhan		42		
Chand Thakur	18353	Fail	—	—
Sh. Shanker Singh		39		
Bharti Chauhan	18354	Pass	—	—
Sh. Tara Chand Verma		52		
Kiran Kaushal	18355	Pass	—	—
Sh. Jagir Singh		50		
Savita Gupta	18356	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bir Singh Gupta		39		
Rita Kashyap	18357	Pass	—	—
Sh. S.R. Kashyap		50		
Padam Singh	18359	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hari Singh		14		
Ramesh Kumar	18360	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gandhi Ram Sharma		26		

1	2	3	4	5
Suresh Kumar	18361	Fail	—	—
Sh. Prem Dass		20		
Sushma Kashyap	18364	Fail	—	—
Sh. J.R. Kashyap		29		
Rattan Chand Gupta	18365	Fail	—	—
Sh. Huma Nand		35		
Mehar Chand Thakur	18366	Fail	—	—
Sh. Meena Ram		17		
Dinesh Kumar Negi	18367	Fail	—	—
Sh. H. Darje		29		
Mohinder Verma	18370	Fail	—	—
Sh. Tulsi Ram		31		
Jagdish Chand	18371	Fail	—	—
Sh. Shiv Ram		32		
Mohan-Lal	18372	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jhanju Ram		2		
Mohinder Singh	18373	Pass	—	—
Sh. C. R. Patial		57		
Tilak Raj Sharma	18374	Fail	—	—
Sh. Paras Ram		30		
Meenakshi Sharda	18375	Fail	—	—
Sh. B. D. Sharda		41		
Shakuntla Pathak	18376	Fail	—	—
Sh. N. R. Pathak		33		
Suman Sood	18377	Fail	—	—
Sh. R. K. Sood		39		
Sudesh Rani	18378	Pass	—	—
Sh. Kishan Singh		50		
Rajeev Bhardwaj	18379	Fail	—	—
Sh. Parmanand		43		
Amar Nath Dhiman	18380	Fail	—	—
Sh. Karam Singh		19		
Anita	18386	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ajit Singh		37		
Bhag Chand Chauhan	18387	Fail	—	—
Sh. Balak Ram		38		
Rajender Singh	18388	Fail	—	—
Sh. J. R. Chauhan		43		
Prem Singh Thakur	18390	Fail	—	—
Sh. Daulat Ram		30		
Yashvir Kumar	18392	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dhani Ram		31		
Gian Chand	18396	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ashok Kumar		35		
Narender Kumar	18397	Fail	—	—
Sh. Chuni Lal		19		
Madho Ram	18398	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kehar Singh		39		
Ajmer Singh	18399	Fail	—	—
Ajit Singh		38		
Sarla Larzoo	18400	Fail	—	—
Sh. Pratap Singh		37		
Upma Dhiman	18401	Fail	—	—
Sh. G. C. Dhiman		34		
Guru Dutt Sharma	18403	Fail	—	—
Sh. G. R. Sharma		22		
Noel Kamal	18404	[Fail	—	—
Sh. D. Singh		38		
Usha Rani	18405	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sant Ram Sharma		27		
Vijay Lakshmi	18406	Pass	—	—
Sh. M. C. Sharma		60		
Baibta Chauhan	18407	Fail	—	—
Sh. Krishan Kumar		35		
Vibhuti Dogar	18408	Pass	—	—
Sh. Jog Raj Dogar		50		
Bhuvnesh Kumar	18414	Pass	—	—
Sh. Hem Raj Sharma		71		
Shashi Bhushan	18415	Fail	—	—
Sh. Nek Chand		29		
Sher Singh	18418	Pass	—	—
Sh. Sukh Dev Singh		56		
Ashok Kumar	18421	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhagat Ram		37		
Mridula Vaidya	18422	Fail	—	—
Sh. C. M. Vaidya		29		
Lalit Kumar	18423	Fail	—	—
Sh. Nek Ram		33		

1	2	3	4	5
Hans Raj	18424	Fail	—	—
Sh. KhemChand		24		
Dev Dutt	18425	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hukam Chand		7		
Bipal Chander	18426	Fail	—	—
Sh. Roop Lal Sharma		16		
Neena	18429	Fail	—	—
Sh. Mangat Ram		29		
Om Prakash Sharma	18431	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kanshi Ram Sharma		20		
Rajender Kumar	18432	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jana Ram		29		
Nain Singh	18433	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sansaru Ram		38		
Jagjeet Singh Rana	18434	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lal Singh Rana		39		
Bhim Singh Jamwal	18435	Fail	—	—
Sh. Inder Singh		39		
Vishwanath Sharma	18437	Fail	—	—
Sh. Padam Nath		23		
Dharmender Kumar	18438	Pass	—	—
Sh. Prem Kumar Sharma		50		
Yovraj	18441	Fail	—	—
Sh. Roop Singh Vaidya		31		
Puran Chand	18442	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ved Prakash		38		
Saroj Bala Kanwar	18443	Pass	—	—
Sh. Rasil Singh		50		
Shavinder Singh	18444	Fail	—	—
Sh. Balwant Singh		33		
Meena Kumari	18445	Fail	—	—
Sh. N. Chaturvedi		38		
Mulkh Raj	18447	Fail	—	—
Sh. Badri Ram		11		
Piar Singh	18449	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ronki Ram		27		
Ramesh Chand	18450	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dilmir Ram		38		
Navindra Singh	18452	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagindra Singh		38		
Rajesh Kumar	18453	Fail	—	—
Sh. Khazana Ram		34		
Nek Ram Thakur	18454	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hari Singh Thakur		28		
Swadesh Kumar	18455	Fail	—	—
Sh. Loharu Ram		32		
Pavan Kumari Soni	18456	Fail	—	—
Sh. Pershotam Dass		13		
Suman Kumar Chaddha	18457	Fail	—	—
Sh. Nand Lal Chaddha		32		
Madan Mohan Gupta	18459	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hira Lal		39		
Asha Devi	18460	Pass	—	—
Sh. Anant Ram		51		
Reeta Bhardwaj	18461	Fail	—	—
Sh. N. R. Bhardwaj		33		
Chinnamma, C. J.	18462	Pass	—	—
Sh. Joseph		54		
Tarsem Lal	18466	Fail	—	—
Sh. Nathu Ram		20		
Roma Sharma	18467	Pass	—	—
Sh. J. D. Sharma		50		
Narinder Kumar	18468	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rai Singh		30		
Anil Kumar	18469	Fail	—	—
Sh. Beli Ram		26		
Bindu Platia	18471	Fail	—	—
Sh. Anant Ram Mehta		31		
Brij Bala	18472	Fail	—	—
Sh. R. N. Farmahan		33		
Naresh Inder Singh	18474	Fail	—	—
Sh. Daya Ram Chauhan		19		

1	2	3	4	5
Balbir Singh Sharma	18476	Pass	—	—
Sh. B. R. Sharma		55		
Om Parkash	18478	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bakshi Ram		37		
Sandesh Kumar	18479	Fail	—	—
Sh. Panju Ram		31		
Ajay Kumar Puri	18480	Fail	—	—
Sh. Santosh Chand		37		
Balbir Singh Thakur	18481	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bansi Ram		33		
Satish Kumar	18482	Fail	—	—
Sh. Niku Ram		23		
Suresh Kumar	18483	Fail	—	—
Sh. Mangat Ram		29		
Vinod Kumar	18484	Fail	—	—
Sh. Harbans Lal		35		
Raj Kumar Sharma	18486	Pass	—	—
Sh. Sukh Ram Sharma		51		
Aditya Rattan	18487	Pass	—	—
Sh. Jagan Nath		67		
Sohan Lal	18488	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bansi Ram		20		
Gopal	18489	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bharat Ram		31		
Ramesh Kumar Himral	18490	Fail	—	—
Sh. Tulsi Ram		27		
Manorma Gautam	18491	Fail	—	—
Sh. K. D. Khajuria		10		
Ramesh Chand	18494	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ratti Ram		52		
Sukhdyaal Sharma	18496	Fail	—	—
Sh. Devi Chand		30		
Ghanshyam Kapoor	18497	Pass	—	—
Sh. Lal Chand		67		
Datendar Kapoor	18498	Fail	—	—
Sh. M. N. Kapoor		39		
Ravinder Singh	18500	Fail	—	—
Sh. Norboozangpo		39		
Pius Bhanu Kapoor	18501	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rajinder Paul		25		
Nupe Ram Kaushal	18502	Fail	—	—
Sh. Chet Ram		33		
Daroga Ram Sharma	18503	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jai Gopal		38		
Ravinder Kumar	18504	Fail	—	—
Sh. Amir Chand		27		
Naresh Kumar	18505	Fail	—	—
Sh. Tilak Chand		28		
Gurcharan Singh	18506	Fail	—	—
Sh. Piar Lal		37		
Mohan Singh Bragta	18507	Fail	—	—
Sh. Durga Nand		5		
Suneel Dutt	18508	Fail	—	—
Sh. Achhar Singh		37		
Mohinder Singh	18509	Fail	—	—
Sh. Satyagar Singh		26		
Arun Gautam	18512	Fail	—	—
Sh. Krishnu Ram		43		
Mohi Ram Chauhan	18513	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ghasi Ram Chauhan		24		
Ganesh Kumar Jaitak	18514	Fail	—	—
Sh. Tek Chand		39		
Anil Kumar	18515	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rattan Singh		30		
Kishori Lal	18516	Fail	—	—
Sh. Prem Chand		37		
Chaman Lal Thakur	18517	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dola Ram Thakur		37		
Parveen Kumar	18518	Pass	—	—
Sh. Tek Chand		53		
Desli Raj Parmar	18519	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gorkh Singh		37		
Santosh Kumar Parmar	18520	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagat Ram		39		
Ram Sawroop Vij	18523	Pass	—	—
Sh. Brij Lal		65		
Parmodh Singh	18524	Pass	—	—
Sh. Chand Singh		53		

1	2	3	4	5
Menakshi	18526	Fail	—	—
Sh. J. Dean		30		
Champa Sharma	18527	Fail	—	—
Sh. R. K. Sharma		27		
Hem Raj Kaushik	18528	Pass	—	—
Sh. Jaya Nand Kaushik		52		
Meena Thakur	18531	Pass	—	—
Sh. Man Singh		50		
Khem Raj Thakur	18532	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dharm Dutt		37		
Ajit Singh	18533	Fail	—	—
Sh. Tulsi Ram		20		
Banshi Lal Sharma	18534	Fail	—	—
Sh. Devi Ram Sharma		35		
Ramesh Chand	18535	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dharam Singh		39		
Rajesh Kumar	18536	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ram Chander		27		
Ashok Pal Attri	18537	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sunder Singh		39		
Jagdish Chand Negi	18538	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Dayal		51		
Dinesh Kumar	18539	Fail	—	—
Sh. Beli Ram		22		
Parkash Chand	18541	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gulaba Ram		25		
Ritz Gupta	18542	Pass	—	—
Sh. V. P. Gupta		54		
Kusum Lata	18543	Fail	—	—
Sh. Mahender Kumar		34		
Neena Sharma	18544	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagdish Ram		29		
Ramesh Kumar Verma	18545	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hari Chand		31		
Kiran Sharma	18552	Pass	—	—
Sh. L. R. Sharma		62		
Raj Pal	18554	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Lal		55		
Kartar Chand Patial	18555	Fail	—	—
Sh. Tihru Ram		39		
Mridula Sharma	18556	Pass	—	—
Sh. Om Parkash Sharma		50		
Meera Tandon	18557	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dhan Dev Kapoor		44		
Pratibha Kapoor	18558	Fail	—	—
Sh. Brijbihari Lal		44		
Brestu Ram	18559	Fail	—	—
Sh. Chuharu Ram		30		
Mangal Chand Negi	18561	Fail	—	—
Sh. Pemba Ram Negi		15		
Fateh Chand	18562	Fail	—	—
Sh. Chhering Palzor		23		
Prem Chand	18563	Pass	—	—
Sh. Sonam Tandup		52		
Yashwant Rai	18564	Fail	—	—
Sh. Munshi Ram		36		
Jagjeet Singh Rana	18565	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rattan Singh Rana		42		
Hira Lal Bhaik	18569	Fail	—	—
Sh. Rama Nand		28		
Shashi Kumari	18570	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ram Parkash		39		
Shashi Sharma	18571	Pass	—	—
Sh. J. C. Sharma		50		
Shyama Verma	18572	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bansi Lal		32		
Sanjeev Kumar	18573	Pass	—	—
Sh. Chuni Lal		50		
Hosiar Singh Rana	18577	Pass	—	—
Sh. B. S. Rana		50		
Girdhari Singh	18579	Fail	—	—
Sh. Padam Singh		23		
Sushma Chauhan	18580	Fail	—	—
Sh. R. N. Chauhan		39		
Prem Lata Kohli	18581	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kishan Chand		28		

1	2	3	4	5
Umesh Bahuguna	18583	Fail	—	—
Sh. G. P. Bahuguna		22		
Surinder Kumar	18586	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gorakh Ram		10		
Kishori Lal	18587	Fail	—	—
Sh Babu Ram		17		
Mast Ram Chauhan	18588	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ram Diyal Chauhan		3		
Lal Chand Katoch	18589	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagat Ram		32		
Sudarshan Kumar	18590	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagdish Chand		18		
Kishori Lal Thakur	18594	Fail	—	—
Sh. Achhar Singh		26		
Champa Kapoor	18595	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ganesh Dass		29		
Virender Kumar	18596	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sukh Dev		38		
Sushil Kumar	18597	Fail	—	—
Sh. Anant Ram		20		
Surat Kamal	18598	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kamal Chand		39		
Karam Singh	18599	Fail	—	—
Sh. Govind Ram		36		
Bhola Dutt Kashyap	18600	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sunder Singh		39		
Keshav Ram Thakur	18601	Pass	—	—
Sh. Nokhu Ram		50		
Lal Singh Parmar	18602	Fail	—	—
Sh. Paras Ram		17		
Surinder Kumar	18604	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lal Singh		12		
Satyapa Sharma	18614	Pass	—	—
Sh. Banarsi Dass		62		
Sanjeev Kumar	18615	Fail	—	—
Sh. Swaroop Chand		33		
Subhash Chand	18616	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sita Ram		25		
Jagdish	18619	Fail	—	—
Sh. Moti Ram		32		
Pyare Lal Kashya	18620	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jagi Ram		36		
Sh. Ram Dutt	18625	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bam Dutt		18		
Niranjan Sharma	18627	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhuvneshwar Dutt		26		
Onkar Singh	18630	Fail	—	—
Sh. Romel Singh		34		
Hans Raj	18631	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jaimal Singh		9		
Bal Krishan Sharma	18633	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bishan Dass		26		
Sanjeev Kumar	18634	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ved Parkash		54		
Rikki Sharma	18635	Pass	—	—
Sh. Rajender Paul		53		
Savita Thakur	18636	Fail	—	—
Sh. Virendra Kumar		24		
Anil Sharma	18637	Fail	—	—
Sh. H. K. Sharma		36		
Anant Ram Sharma	18638	Pass	—	—
Sh. Paras Ram		50		
Chhotu Ram Negi	18640	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dhaulat Ram		28		
Neera Negi	18641	Pass	—	—
Sh. B. D. Janartha		50		
Krishan Negi	18642	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Chander Negi		62		
Atma Singh	18643	Fail	—	—
Sh. Durga Dass		28		
Suneeta Sharma	18644	Fail	—	—
Sh. M. R. Sharma		39		

1	2	3	4	5
Subhash Chand Sareen	18645	Pass	—	—
Sh. Partap Chand		51		
Saroj Changra	18646	Fail	—	—
Sh. B.R. Changra		32		
Sukh Ram Sharma	18647	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sohan Lal		26		
Sukh Dev	18649	Pass	—	—
Sh. Lekh Ram		56		
Renu Vohra	18650	Pass	—	—
Sh. K. K. Vohra		50		
Kishan Chand	18651	Pass	—	—
Sh. Dagu Ram		51		
Amar Nath	18652	Pass	—	—
Sh. Prithi Chand		50		
Jyoti Rana	18653	Pass	—	—
Sh. H. S. Pathania		52		
Poonam Sood	18654	Pass	—	—
Sh. Phool Kumar		62		
Raviinder Singh	18655	Fail	—	—
Sh. Changhar Singh		39		
Jagroop Singh	18656	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bansi Ram		37		
Ramesh Chand Sharma	18658	Pass	—	—
Sh. Ram Dass		50		
Arif Qureshi	18659	Pass	—	—
Sh. Nazir Qureshi		51		
Bhopal Singh	18660	Pass	—	—
Sh. Chhota Ram		60		
Ranjeet Singh	18661	Fail	—	—
Sh. Satyager Singh		32		
Pardeep Kumar	18662	Pass	—	—
Sh. Udho Ram		50		
Naveen Kumar	18663	Pass	—	—
Sh. Raj Kumar		50		
Vishwanath	18664	Fail	—	—
Sh. D.C. Malkotia		28		
Anil Nag	18665	Fail	—	—
Sh. S. P. Nag		37		
Sanjay Kumar	18666	Pass	—	—
Sh. Kashmir Singh		52		
Sarita Jaggi	18667	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ram Chand		37		
Krishanu Ram	18668	Fail	—	—
Sh. Hari Ram		8		
Punam Sharma	18669	Pass	—	—
Sh. Madan Sarup		50		
Samriti Thakur	18670	Fail	—	—
Sh. K. D. Verma		37		
Ranjeet Singh	18672	Fail	—	—
Sh. Mohan Lal		17		
Bhagwan Dass	18673	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jogi Ram		39		
Ajeet Singh	18674	Pass	—	—
Sh. Dev Raj		62		
Ramesh Kumar	18676	Pass	—	—
Sh. Mansha Ram		56		
Neelam Sharma	18677	Fail	—	—
Sh. J. C. Sharma		38		
Bhed Prakash Sharma	18678	Pass	—	—
Sh. Neel Kanth		55		
Devinder Prabha	18679	Fail	—	—
Sh. Narotam Chand		18		
Chhaya	18680	Fail	—	—
Sh. Satish Chand		29		
Anila Sharma	18681	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lal Chand		33		
Meena Kumari Gupta	18682	Fail	—	—
Sh. N. L. Gupta		25		
Urmila Devi	18683	Fail	—	—
Sh. PermaNand		15		
Prashant Kumar	18684	Fail	—	—
Sh. Babu Rain		22		
Mahesh Sharma	18685	Fail	—	—
Sh. Jeet Ram Sharma		21		

1	2	3	4	5
Ram Kumar Bhardwaj	18693	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kishori Lal		24		
Shalini Sharma	18694	Fail	—	—
Sh. Om Parkash Sharma		20		
Kripa Devi	18696	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gian Chand		19		
Ajit Singh	18698	Fail	—	—
Sh. Khilru Ram		37		
Premi Devi Sehgal	18701	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sunder Ram		16		
Rajeev Sharma	18703	Fail	—	—
Sh. M. K. Sharma		25		
Dinesh Sood	18705	Fail	—	—
Sh. Pritam Chand		12		
Kanwar Vijay Singh	18706	Fail	—	—
Sh. Lekh Ram		19		
Balbir Singh	18707	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sher Singh		27		
Lachhman Singh	18708	Fail	—	—
Sh. Pohlo Ram		36		
Rajesh Kumar	18709	Pass	—	—
Sh. Rup Lal		50		
Tara Avasthi	18710	Pass	—	—
Sh. Purna Nand		51		
Suman Sharma	18711	Pass	—	—
Sh. Jagdish Sharma		50		
Rajni Sharma	18712	Fail	—	—
Sh. Des Raj		27		
Kuldeep Kumar	18713	Fail	—	—
Sh. Ganga Ram		28		
Desh Raj	18714	Pass	—	—
Sh. Phuman Ram		50		
Parshotam Lal	18715	Fail	—	—
Sh. Gurdas Mal		39		
Tek Parshad	18718	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kanshi Ram		35		
Shiv Prabhakar	18719	Fail	—	—
Sh. G. D. Shastri		32		
Sukh Dev	18720	Pass	—	—
Sh. Bhup Chand		50		
Prabhat Kishore	18721	Pass	—	—
Sh. Krishan Dass		54		
Gurdass Singh	18722	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dipu Ram		36		
Raj Kumar	18723	Pass	—	—
Sh. Shankar Singh		60		
Ishwar Dass	18726	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhgat Ram		31		
Padam Dev Kaundal	18727	Fail	—	—
Sh. Sauju Ram		25		
Amar Nath Choudhary	18728	Fail	—	—
Sh. Dharam Singh		37		
Parminder Thakur	18729	Fail	—	—
Sh. J. R. Thakur		32		
Pyare Lal	18732	Fail	—	—
Sh. Kanshi Ram		17		
Nalini Thakur	18734	Pass	—	—
Sh. S. S. Parmar		65		
Namrta Katoch	18735	Pass	—	—
Sh. R. C. Katoch		54		
Suresh Chand Joshi	18736	Pass	—	—
Sh. Mast Ram Joshi		53		
Ranjana Sharma	18739	Fail	—	—
Sh. Doman Prakash		33		
Dharam Paul Saroch	18740	Fail	—	—
Sh. Manohar Lal		24		
Ashutosh Kumar	18741	Fail	—	—
Sh. Bhagi Rath		15		
Vikram Singh	18742	Fail	—	—
Sh. Amar Singh		25		
Prem Singh Jamwal	18743	Fail	—	—
Sh. Pohlo Ram		23		

1	2	3	4	5
Jagdish Chand Bali Sh. Badri Dass	18745	Fail 24	—	—
Rajesh Kumar Sh. Prem Pal	18746	Fail 29	—	—
R.S. Chauhan Sh. A.S. Chauhan	18747	Fail 26	—	—
Rakesh Kapoor Sh. Tek Chand Kapoor	18748	Pass 50	—	—
Rajinder Dev Sh. K. N. Sharma	18749	Fail 41	—	—
Sanjeev Sharma Sh. S.N. Sharma	18750	Fail 44	—	—
Asha Sood Sh. Gian Chand	18751	Pass 53	—	—
Puran Chand Sh. Nathu Ram	18754	Fail 24	—	—
Pratibha Sood Sh. Gopal Dass	18755	Fail 18	—	—
Gopal Krishan Sh. V. N. Chauhan	18758	Fail 9	—	—
Diwan Chandel Sh. Ganga Ram	18759	Pass 66	—	—
Balwinder Kumar Sh. Amar Nath	18760	Pass 56	—	—
Sher Singh Sh. Shiv Ram	18761	Fail 15	—	—
Thakaru Ram Sh. Bhagat Ram	18762	Fail 39	—	—
Kartar Singh Sh. Rattan Singh	18763	Fail 31	—	—
Jagdish Kumar Sh. Bhup Chand	18764	Fail 41	—	—
Raj Kumar Sh. Mansa Ram	18765	Fail 43	—	—
Amita Gupta Sh. Om Prakash	18767	Fail 36	—	—
Onkar Singh Verma Sh. Karam Singh	18776	Fail 44	—	—
Parkash Chand Sh. Munshi Ram	18777	Fail 30	—	—
Om Prakash Heer Sh. Dhani Ram	18778	Pass 51	—	—
Yash Pal Singh Sh. Balwant Singh	18779	Fail 39	—	—
Rajender Kumar Sh. Mela Ram	18781	Pass 56	—	—
Ranjee, Kumari Sh. Bhag Singh	18784	Fail 39	—	—
Vinod Kumar Sh. Prithvi Singh	18785	Fail 42	—	—
Sanjeev Prasher Sh. Amar Nath	18787	Fail 30	—	—
Romesh Chand Sh. Mouji Ram	18789	Fail 39	—	—
Radha Krishan Sh. Devi Ram	18796	Fail 21	—	—
Savita Jaggi Sh. Mohinder Nath	18798	Fail 33	—	—
Shakel Ahmad Sh. Abdul Azeez	18801	Fail 30	—	—
Prem Singh Dhiman Sh. Mast Ram	18806	Fail 20	—	—
Sukh Dev Sh. Narjeet	18807	Fail 33	—	—
Mohan Lal Aggarwal Sh. Babu Ram	18808	Fail 39	—	—
Binta Sharma Sh. Jagat Ram	18809	Fail 32	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
Lila Dhar Vatsyavan Sh. Chander Mani	18812	Fail 12	—	—
Sonam Dolma Sh. Dola Ram	18816	Fail 7	—	—
Sita Ram Lt. Sh. Moti Ram	18817	Fail 32	—	—

DEPARTMENT : FISHERIES

R. P. Dogra Sh. K. R. Dogra	17050	Pass 51	—	—
--------------------------------	-------	------------	---	---

DEPARTMENT : FORENSIC

Meenakshi Mahajan Sh. M. L. Mahajan	17049	ABS ABS	—	Pass 54
--	-------	------------	---	------------

DEPARTMENT : FOREST

Lalit Chander Katoch Sh. S. C. Katoch	17100	—	—	Pass 50
Jai Ram Thakur Lt. Sh. R. L. Thakur	17105	Fail 17	—	Fail 31
Narinder Singh Sh. Ram Singh	17107	Pass 56	—	—
Bhupesh Mohan Marol Sh. D. R. Marol	17108	Fail 36	—	Pass 57
Som Parkash Sharma Sh. R. L. Sharma	17109	Fail 31	—	—
Inder Kumar Gahlot Lt. Sh. Ramesh Chand	17110	Fail 22	—	Fail 32
Jaswant Kumar Dogra Lt. Sh. Roshan Lal Dogra	17111	Fail 33	—	Pass 53
Anil Kumar Misra Sh. Mast Ram	17114	—	—	Pass 52
Surjeet Mehra Lt. Sh. M. L. Mehra	17115	ABS ABS	—	Pass 57
Sh. Hoshiar Singh Pal Sh. Tehal Singh	17116	Fail 37	—	Pass 58
Yash Pal Garneria Sh. R. Garneria	17117	Pass 51	—	Pass 51
Devi Dayal Aggarwal Sh. Bir Bhan Aggarwal	17118	—	—	Pass 51
Kirti Singh Thakur Sh. Moti Ram Thakur	17119	—	—	ABS ABS
Surinder Paul Singh Sh. Rattan Singh	17122	Fail 38	—	ABS ABS

DEPARTMENT: HEALTH

Tapan Kumar Roy Sh. Kartick Chandra	17015	Pass 60	—	—
Suman Sharma Lt. Sh. Trilok Nath	17016	Fail 34	—	—
Harjitpal Singh Sh. Yashpal Singh	17017	Fail 38	—	—
Rajiva Ranjan Sh. R. K. Bahadur	17019	Fail 26	—	—
B. M. Gupta Lt. Sh. Kapur Chand	17022	Pass 50	—	—

DEPARTMENT : HORTICULTURE

Rajinder Parshad Lt. Sh. Sita Ram	17158	Fail 20	—	Fail 46
Virender K. Sharma Sh. Babu Ram Sharma	17159	Fail 27	—	—
Madan S. Thakur Sh. Dila Ram Thakur	17161	Fail 17	—	—
Arjun Dev Sharma Lt. Sh. Salig Ram	17162	Fail 12	—	Fail 41
Brij Mohan Sood Lt. Sh. Purshotam Dass	17163	Pass 50	—	Pass 50

1	2	3	4	5
Ishwar Dass Kanwal Sh. Diwan Ram	17164	Fail 33	—	—
Prem Chand Dogra Sh. Rigim	17165	Fail 34	—	—
Deep Ram Thakur Sh. Narotam Dass	17166	Fail 35	—	Pass 53
Jitender Vij Lt. Sh. Des Raj Vij	17167	Fail 37	—	—
Hem Chand Sharma Sh. Vijay Ram Sharma	17168	Fail 24	—	—
Pritam Singh Thakur Sh. Sohan Singh	17169	—	—	Fail 44
Tek Chand Thakur Sh. Dagu Ram	17171	Fail 23	—	Fail 45
Bhagi Chand Rana Sh. Tek Chand Rana	17122	Fail 39	—	—
Gian Singh Verma Lt. Sh. Narain Singh	17173	Fail 36	—	Pass 69
Rajinder K. Sharma Sh. Jagat Ram Sharma	17174	Pass 52	—	Pass 50
Mehar Singh Rana Lt. Sh. Z. R. Rana	17175	Fail	—	—
Guler Chand Dhiman Sh. A.P. Dhiman	17176	Fail 32	—	Fail 44
Prem Singh Verma Lt. Sh. M.R. Verma	17177	Fail 12	—	Pass 50
Kushmayudh Kumar Sh. Inder Dev	17178	Fail 21	—	Fail 42
Mahender Pal Gupta Sh. S. R. Gupta	17179	Fail 38	—	Fail 32
Gopal Sharma Sh. Raghunath Sharma	17180	ABS ABS	—	Fail 45
Sarjit K. Vashist Lt. Sh. Ishwar Dass	17182	Fail 34	—	—
Pat Ram Raghuvanshi Sh. Mathu Ram	17183	Fail 37	—	—
Kuldeep Chand Sharda Sh. Rama Nand Sharda	17185	Fail 39	—	Pass 50
Ram Prakash Sharma Sh. D. R. Sharma	17186	Fail 27	—	—
Baldev Sh. Rup Chand	17189	Fail 32	—	Pass 61
Narinder Pal Singh Sh. Parshotam Singh	17191	Pass 59	—	—
Santosh K. S. Bakshi Sh. S.K. Bakshi	17192	Fail 24	—	Fail 34
K. K. Joshi Sh. P. D. Joshi	17193	Fail 31	—	—
Kirti Kumar Sh. D. S. Sinha	17195	Fail 15	—	Pass 59
Rabinder Nath Sh. Saran Dass	17196	Fail 16	—	Fail 31
Sukarm Thakur Sh. N.R. Thakur	97197	Fail 32	—	Pass 58

DEPARTMENT : L/C

Tulsi Raman Sh. M. R. Sharma	17001	Pass 50	—	—
Asha Sood Sh. H.R. Geel	17002	Pass 50	—	—

DEPARTMENT : PWD

Jitender Kumar Sh. Chaman Lal	17198	Pass 52	—	Pass 67
Pasang Negi Sh. Ringzin Negi	17199	Fail 37	—	Pass 60
Sita Ram Thakur Sh. Tulsi Ram Thakur	17201	Fail 8	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
Krishan Kumar Sh. S. D. Kaushal	17202	Fail 32	—	Pass 80
Raj Kumar Thakur Lt. Sh. Mohan Lal	17203	ABS ABS	—	Pass 70
Bir Chand Negi Sh. G.S. Negi	17204	Fail 12	—	Fail 40
Ghanshyam Raman Sh. C. R. Sharma	17206	Fail 34	—	—
Prem Chand Ranot Sh. Kanshi Ram	17207	ABS ABS	—	Pass 70
Atam Singh Thakur Lt. Sh. C. R. Thakur	17208	Fail 36	—	Fail 41
Paras Ram Chechi Sh. Gandhi Ram	17209	Fail 26	—	Pass 70
Himanshu Bisht Sh. G.L. Bisht	17210	Pass 50	—	Pass 60
Surinder Paul Sh. N. R. Jagota	17211	Fail 24	—	Pass 55
Harnam S. Kaundal Sh. Munshi Ram	17212	Fail 38	—	—
Mahesh Rana Sh. T. R. Rana	17213	Fail 38	—	—
Bhag Singh Thakur Sh. Mahantu Ram	17214	Pass 50	—	—
Arvind Kumar Sh. Shankar Dass	17215	Pass 61	—	—
Dinesh K. Dhiman Sh. Hira Lal	17216	Fail 22	—	—
Anil Kumar Dhiman Sh. S.K. Dhiman	17217	Fail 41	—	Pass 66
Vishwa Nath Prasher Sh. Lekh Raj Prasher	17218	Pass 52	—	—
Ramesh S. Sandhu Sh. N.S. Sandhu	17219	Fail 42	—	—
Rameshwar Dass Sh. M. Ram	17221	Pass 50	—	Pass 64
Naresh K. Gupta Lt. Sh. K.K. Gupta	17222	Pass 50	—	Pass 62
Rajinder Prashad Sh. Hakam Chand	17224	Fail 26	—	Pass 52
Vijay Kumar Attri Sh. Bishan Dass	17225	Fail 8	—	Fail 46
Mehar Chand Pawar Lt. Sh. R. M. Pawar	17226	Fail 26	—	—
Rajinder Singh Sh. Sarwan Singh	17227	Fail 39	—	Pass 75
B. R. Suman Sh. Gambu Ram	17228	Fail 36	—	Pass 77
Pradeep Vaidya Sh. T. C. Vaidya	17229	Fail 34	—	—
Gurcharan Singh Sh. Mehar Chand	17230	Fail 24	—	Pass 71
Rajesh Kumar Sh. Shanker Dass	17231	Fail 35	—	—
Rohit Thakur Sh. P. S. Thakur	17232	Fail 39	—	—
Rattan Kumar Sharma Sh. Narain Dutt	17233	Pass 51	—	—
Kamal Naresh Mahajan Lt. Sh. Mohan Lal	17234	Pass 54	—	Pass 57
Arun Kumar Sh. Som Raj	17235	Pass 61	Pass 65	—
Rakesh Kumar Sh. Raghu Nath	17236	Fail 37	—	Pass 70
Rattan Chand Kapoor Lt. Sh. Haria Ram	17237	Fail 37	—	Pass 70
Bhupesh Chand Sharma Sh. P. C. Sharma	17238	Fail 35	—	Pass 71
Umesh Sharma Sh. Subhash Chand	17239	Fail 38	—	Pass 71

1	2	3	4	5
Hardev Singh Lt. Sh. Sita Ram	17240	Fail 42	—	—
Rakesh Kumar Sh. J. R. Dhiman	17241	Fail 30	—	—
Vijay Kumar Gupta Sh. M. L. Gupta	17242	Fail 33	—	Pass 66
Pyush Dogra Sh. Ramesh Dogra	17244	—	—	ABS ABS
Partap Singh Rana Sh. Dile Ram	17245	Fail 34	—	—
Surender Paul Sen Lt. Sh. Rattan Singh	17246	Pass 50	—	Pass 68
Rajiv Sharma Sh. Bihari Lal Sharma	17247	Fail 30	—	—
Veena Kumari Verma Sh. H. C. Pathania	17248	Pass 50	—	—
Kahan Singh Chauhan Sh. B. R. Chauhan	17249	Fail 38	—	—
Lude Mani Mastana Sh. Sant Ram	17251	Fail 30	—	—
Bhag Mal Thakur Sh. Amar Singh	18818	Fail 36	—	Pass 67

DEPARTMENT : PROSECUTION

Chander Singh Sh. S. N. Chauhan	17009	Fail 30	—	—
Sunil D. Vasudeva Sh. S. D. Vasudeva	17011	Fail 37	—	—

DEPARTMENT : T & A

Rajinder Kumar Sh. Ram Path	17092	Pass 52	—	ABS ABS
Tilak Ram Sharma Sh. B. R. Sharma	17093	Pass 53	—	Fail 36
Shanti Bodi Sh. N. T. Bodi	17096	Fail 27	—	Fail 16
Ajay Kumar Sh. Gian Chand	17097	Fail 37	—	Fail 33
Rakesh Dharmani Sh. N. L. Dharmani	17098	Pass 53	—	—

DEPARTMENT : TCP

Asha Mehta Lt. Sh. N. L. Chittu	17025	Fail 25	—	—
Satish Sharma Sh. R. C. Sharma	17027	Fail 39	—	—

DEPARTMENT : TECH. EDU.

Sameer Bharti Sh. S. P. Gupta	17030	Pass 50	—	—
Rajinder S. Barwal Lt. Sh. Bhagmal	17031	Pass 58	—	—
Umesh Chand Rathore Lt. Sh. K. C. Rathore	17032	Pass 54	—	—
Naina Lakhanpal Sh. P. C. Verma	17033	Fail 37	—	—
Puneet Sood Sh. Surinder Sood	17034	Fail 39	—	—
Sher Singh Sh. Tashi Norbu	17035	Fail 25	—	—
Tanmay Kapoor Sh. A. L. Kapoor	17036	Pass 50	—	—
Anita Joshi Sh. P. L. Sharma	17037	Fail 38	—	—
Deepak Kumar Sh. R. K. Bansal	17039	Pass 72	—	—
Satish Kumar Lt. Sh. Gulaba Ram	17040	Fail 21	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
Naresh K. Sapehia Lt. Sh. Bhagwan Dass	17041	Fail 31	—	—
Desh Raj Sharma Sh. M. R. Sharma	17042	Pass 60	—	—
Rajesh Sharma Sh. Ram Swaroop	17043	Pass 50	—	—
Anil Kumar Sh. S. B. Rewal	17044	Fail 37	—	—
Chander Shekhar Sh. Diwana Ram	17046	Fail 38	—	—
Kishore C. Katoch Sh. D. C. Katoch	17048	Fail 38	—	—

Note.—1. Every possible care has been taken in compiling information given in respect of Papers. It is however possible that some error therein may have occurred inadvertently. All concerned are therefore requested to check the aforesaid information and to bring to the notice of the board, if any mistake is found therein.

2. Re-evaluation is allowed where score is between 40 to 49 marks. Candidates may apply in simple application form within 21 days of issue of result card alongwith Bank Draft of Rs. 100.00 for each paper in favour of Secretary, Board of Departmental Examinations, Fairlawns, Shimla-171012.

Sd/-
Secretary,
H. P. Board of Departmental Examinations,
Fairlawns, Shimla-171012.

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 21st September, 2002

No. Shram (A) 7-1/2002.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 17(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of awards in the Rajpatra announced by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, H. P. of the following cases:—

S. No.	Ref.	Particulars	Section	Remarks
1	2	3	4	
1.	Ref. No. 25/1999—Smt. Chander Kanta Vs. General Secy. Him Shakti Privahan Nigam Karamchhari Sangh, Sanjauli, Shimla.	10	Publication	
2.	Ref. No. 253/1998—Shyam Lal C/o The General Secy. AITUC Vs. The General Manager M/s Hitkari Potteries Ltd. Plastic Division Plot No. 1 Parwanoo.	10	-do-	
3.	Ref. No. 73/1999—Kumari Kanchan Sen Vs. M/s Gabriel (I) Ltd. Parwanoo, District Solan (H. P.).	10	-do-	
4.	Ref. No. 70/1999—Shri Bhim Singh Vs. Secy. Horticulture Department H. Q. and anothers.	10	-do-	
5.	Ref. No. 16/2000—Smt. Reena Devi Vs. Shri Sudhir Mahindroo, Prop. M/s Suraj Hosiery Chamba-ghat, Solan.	10	-do-	
6.	Ref. No. 55/1998—Shri Mohan Lal Vs. Secy. H. P. S. E. B. Government of H. P. & anothers.	10	-do-	

1	2	3	4
7.	Ref. No. 249/2000—Shri Hira Singh and others Vs. Secy. (PWD) Government of H. P. & others.	10	Publicity
8.	Ref. No. 116/2000—Shri Jagat Singh & others Vs. Secy. (PWD) Government of H. P. & others.	10	-do-
9.	Ref. No. 79/1999—Shri Tulsi Ram & 3 others Vs. The DFO, Renuka Forest Division Renuka, Sirmaur.	10	-do-
10.	Ref. No. 35/2001—Shri Raghubir Singh Vs. MD, HRTC, Nahan. District Sirmaur (H.P.).	10	-do-
11.	Ref. No. 116/1999—Shri Surat Ram & 15 others Vs. H. P. State Forest Corporation through M. D. SML and others.	10	-do-
12.	Ref. No. 115/1999—Shri Laiq Ram & 5 others Vs. M. D., H. P. State Forest Corporation Shimla & Ors.	10	-do-
13.	Ref. No. 114/1999—Shri Sunil Dutt Vs. H. P. State Forest Corporation Shimla & others.	10	-do-
14.	Ref. No. 217/1998—Shri Bala Ram & 7 others Vs. Secy. (PWD) Government of H. P., Shimla & Ors.	10	-do-
15.	Ref. No. 157/1999—Gen. Secy./President Himalyan Mazdoor Union P/Sahib Vs. M/s Himalyan Forest and Agro Products (P) Ltd. P/Sahib Sirmaur H. P.	10	-do-

1	2	3	4
16.	Ref. No. 160/1998—Shri Yash Pal Vs. Rakesh Khurana.	10	Publication
17.	Ref. No. 37/1998—Ramzan Mohamad (Mason) Vs. Ex. Engg. H.P.P.W.D. Division No. 1 Bilaspur (H.P.).	10	-do-
18.	Ref. No. 156/2002—Shri Jagat Ram Vs. Manager Hotel, Le-Royala Jakhoo Road near Ridge, Shimla-1.	10	-do-
19.	Ref. No. 51/200—Shri Roop Singh Vs. General Manager, Rosin & Turpentine (R&T) Factory Nahan, Sirmaur (H. P.).	10	-do-

By order,
HARINDER HIRA,
Principal Secretary.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
Labour Court, Shimla.

Ref. No. 25/99

Smt. Chander Kanta

Versus

General Secretary, Him Shakti Parivahan Nigam
Karamchari Sangh, Sanjauli, Shimla-6.

23-7-2002—Present.—None for petitioner.
Shri Shashi Shirshu, Advocate LD. CL.
for Respondent.

The case called twice, but none has appeared on behalf of the petitioner. It is 11.30 A.M., It be kept for waiting so as to be called again in the after noon.

Seal. V. K. SHARMA,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal.
cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 25/99

Smt. Chander Kanta .. Petitioner.

Versus

General Secretary Him Shakti Parivahan Nigam
Karamchari Sangh, Sanjauli, Shimla .. Respondent.

23-7-2002: Present.—As above

(After noon)

Case called twice again. However, none has put appearance on behalf of the petitioner. It is 3 40 p. m. According the petition is dismissed for default in appearance on behalf of petitioner and the reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this order be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official Gazette.

Announced 23-7-2002.

Seal. Sd/-
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 253 of 1998

Instituted on : 23-11-1998

Decided on : 29-7-2002

Shri Shayam Lal s/o Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, General
Secretary, H.P. AITUC, Head Office, Saproon, Solan.

Versus

The General Manager M/s Hitkari Potteries Ltd.,
(Plastic Division) Plot No. 4, Sector-1, Parwanoo.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes
Act, 1947.

For petitioner: Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, AR.

For respondent: Shri A. K. Sharma, AR.

AWARD

The present petition arises out of the following reference made by the appropriate Government:—

1. "Whether Shri Shayam Lal is workman ?"
2. "If yes, whether the termination of services of Shri Shayam Lal workman by the management of M/s Hitkari, Potteries Ltd. (Plastic Division), Parwanoo, District Solan, w. e. f. 25-2-1998, without any notice, charge sheet, enquiry & further without compliance of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified, if not to what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation, Shri Shayam Lal is entitled to ?"

3. In brief, the facts pleaded by the parties can be stated thus. The petitioner joined the respondent company as Mechanical Supervisor or somewhere in September, 1995 later on, he was promoted as Assistant Engineer on 12-5-1995 with monthly salary of Rs. 2150/-. It is averred that on 25-2-1998, when the petitioner reported for duty, he was not allowed to enter the factory by use of force. According to the petitioner, it amounted to removal from service. His dues were also not cleared in violation of the mandatory provisions of the payment of wages act. The petitioner has alleged that his services were terminated in violation of provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (The act). In so much as neither statutory notice was issued nor retrenchment compensation was paid despite that he had completed the requisite continuous service for not less than one year. The termination is stated to be based on the principal of hire and fire and thus arbitrary and violation of Articles 21 & 24 of the Constitution of India. Petitioner seeks re-instatement along with all the consequential benefits such as seniority and back wages etc.

4. In the reply filed on behalf of the respondent, a preliminary objection has been raised that the petitioner was working in the Supervisory capacity as Assistant Engineer and is not a workman within the definition of Section 2 (s) of the act. On merits, it is admitted that the petitioner was initially employed as Mechanical Supervisor and was later on promoted as Assistant Engineer and was lastly drawing "wages" of Rs. 3500/- per month. It is denied that services of the petitioner were terminated on the basis of a false charge and instead it is alleged that he himself remained absent from duty without intimation and did not turn up to join duty despite issuance of registered letters. Thus, according to the respondent, the petitioner himself abandoned the employment. It is lastly averred that the company had to suffer heavy losses due to the negligence on the part of the petitioner. When his explanation was called, he abandoned the employment.

5. The petitioner has filed rejoinder, wherein he has refuted the stand on behalf of the respondent and instead has reiterated his own case.

6. On the above pleadings, the following issues were settled by my learned predecessor in office on 22-6-2000;—

1. Whether the services of the petitioner has been terminated in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ? OPP.
2. Whether the petitioner is not a workman ? If so, its effect ? OPR.
3. Relief.

7. The parties have led evidence. I have heard their representatives and gone through the record.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter, my findings on the above issue are as under :—

FINDINGS

9. *Issue No. 2.*—Since issue No. 2 relates to the status of the petitioner as workman and goes to the very root of the case, it shall be appropriate to deal with the same first and I proceed to do so.

10. It is admitted case of the parties that the petitioner was initially recruited as Mechanical Supervisor somewhere in September, 1995 and was later on promoted as Assistant Engineer on 12-5-1997, and continued in service upto 25-2-98. However, whereas the petitioner has averred that he was lastly drawing wages @ Rs. 2150/- per month, as per respondent, these were Rs. 3500/- in his desposition as PW-1, the petitioner has stated on oath that he used to rectify the faults in the machines manually. In cross-examination, he has deposed that he used to look after the work of the entire shift. However, he was not assigning duties to the workers. According to him, he used to attend the emergencies in his shift. It is denied that he used to assign work to the workers working during his shift.

11. To the contrary, RW-1, Shri Harmeet Singh, Manager Administration of the respondent company has stated on oath that the petitioner had joined as Mechanical Supervisor in May, 1995. He was performing the duties of Shift Incharge and was wholly responsible for all the work and used to report to the Production Manager. Ex. RW-1/A-1 to 7 are copies of the production reports. He also used to sign the job cards as shift Incharge. The copy of the job card is Ex. RW-1/B. However, the petitioner was not confronted either with the aforesaid production reports or the job cards. Leave is sanctioned by the Shift Incharge. He also issues the gate pass. The material is sent out of the Factory premises by the Shift Incharge. In 1997, the petitioner was promoted as Assistant Engineer (Production) vide letter Ex. RW-1/C. In cross-examination RW-1 Shri Harmeet Singh has admitted that there is no record to show that the petitioner used to sanction leave to the workers. It is admitted that he was not their appointing authority. However, it is stated that he was competent to issue show cause notice to the defaulting workers. However, the witness has admitted that he has no such record, as according to him, no such notice might have been issued during his tenure. It is further stated by the witness that duties are defined in the Standing Orders. It is denied that Shift Incharge or Assistant Engineer (Production) is only required to set right the machines. According to him, rather it is one of his jobs besides being overall Supervisor of the Shift, production, planner etc.

12. In order to ascertain the status of the petitioner as a workman or otherwise, apart from above evidence led on behalf of the parties, it shall be appropriate to refer to the definition of workman under Section 2(s) of the Act, which is reproduced below for ready reference:—

{Section 2(s) "workmen" means any person (including an apprentice) in any industry

to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purpose of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person:—

- (i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or
- (ii) who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison; or
- (iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or
- (iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding one thousand six hundred rupees per mensem or exercise, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, functions mainly of a managerial nature".

13. Though the onus to prove this issue has been placed on the respondent, yet it is settled that the burden of proof is on the workman who has to establish the employer-employee relationship. In other words, where a person asserts the relationship and it is denied by the employer it is for him and not for employer to prove the fact. Reliance placed on SWAPAN DASS GUPTA Vs FIRST LABOUR COURT OF WEST BENGAL, 1976 Lab. I, C-202 (Cal).

14. In view of the above definition of workman, the petitioner is required to prove that his services fall within either of following categories : (i) Manual work, (ii) Un-skilled work, (iii) Skilled work, (iv) Technical work, (v) Operational work, (vi) Clerical work, (vii) Supervisory work.

15. In order to be a workman, the employee should also not fall within the exclusionary clauses (i)–(iv) of Section 2 (s) of the Act. In order to ascertain whether an employee is workman or not, his designation is not of much importance and what is important is the nature of duties being performed by him as has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in S. K. MAINI Vs CARONA SAHU CO. LTD. 1994 LLR 321.

16. The petitioner has placed reliance on the following authorities:—

2. 1999 LLR 729 (Bombay).
3. 1990 L & I C 645 (Allahabad).
4. 1991 LLR 422 (Bombay).
5. 1992 LLR 911 (Bombay).
6. 2000 LLR 413 (SC).
7. 2000 LLR 312 (SC).
8. 2001 LLR 1116 (SC).

17. There is no dispute that the petitioner does not fall within the exclusionary clauses (i) & (ii) of the Section 2(s) of the Act. The evidence on record as noticed above also does not leave any doubt that he also does not fall within exclusionary clause (iii) of the said section as he was not employed 'mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity'. Though the petitioner was earlier designated as Mechanical Supervisor and was later on promoted as Assistant Engineer and was lastly drawing monthly

wages more than Rs. 1600/- yet, the evidence on record would go to show that he was not either performing duties in 'supervisory capacity' or was exercising 'function mainly of a managerial nature'. It is admitted that apart from supervising the work during a shift he also used to put in technical work in the shape of maintenance and repair of machinery. In somewhat similar situation an Assistant Engineer working in a sugar factory was held to be a workman by the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court in *M/s U.P. State Sugar Corporation Limited, Meerut V. Deputy Labour Commissioner, U. P. Meerut and others*; 1990 Lab. I. C. 645 (*Supra*).

18. In view of the above, it is held that the petitioner fell within the definition of workman under Section 2(s) of the act. The issue is decided accordingly in favour of the workman.

19. *Issue No. 1.*—It is averred by the petitioner in Para-4 of the petition that a false accusation of negligence was levelled against him by the management. In Para 3 of the reply, it is alleged by the respondent company that it had to suffer heavy losses due to negligence on the part of the petitioner. However, in Para 2 of the reply, it is denied that services of the petitioner were terminated on the basis of a stigma and instead it is alleged that he had abandoned the employment on getting better job. A combined and harmonious reading of the pleadings on behalf of the parties to this extent would go to show that it, *prima-facie*, appears that services of the petitioner were dispensed with by the respondent as a punitive measure, but without taking resort to the mandatory, legal prerequisite such as holding a domestic enquiry. This inference would lead to the natural corollary that while terminating the service the petitioner, the respondent also did not observe the mandatory requirements regarding issuance of notices under clause (a) and (c) and payment of retrenchment compensation under clause (b) of Section 25-F of the Act.

20. The communications exchanged between the parties would also go to show that the services of the petitioner were terminated by the respondent as a punitive measure but without holding any domestic enquiry and observing the mandatory provisions of the Act. These are application Ex. PA and explanations Ex. PB, PD (also exhibited as RW-1/F), PF and Ex. RW-1/E, submitted by the petitioner to the authorities of the respondent and Memos Ex. PC, PE, PG & Ex. 1/C issued by the respondent to the petitioner.

The above discussion leads me to hold that the termination of the services of the petitioner, a workman, by the respondent company unilaterally is in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act. The issue is accordingly decided in affirmative.

RELIEF

21. In the result, the petitioner is entitled for reinstatement in service on and *w.e.f.* 25-2-1998. Ordered accordingly. He shall be entitled to continuity in service and seniority. The petitioner has set up claim for back wages in the petition as also in his statement as PW-1. The claim has not been refuted by the respondent either in the reply or in the evidence. Thus in the facts and circumstances of the case, it shall not be unsafe to hold that the petitioner is entitled to back wages. Ordered accordingly.

22. The reference stands answered in the above terms. Let a copy of the award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court, today this the 29th day of July, 2002.

Seal.

V. K. SHARMA,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour
Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 73/99

Kumari Kanchan Sen

Versus

M/s Gabriel India Ltd., Parwanoo, District Solan
(H. P.)

29-7-2002 : *Present* : None for petitioner.

Shri V. K. Gupta, AR for the respondent.

Notice for appearance was issued to the petitioner through registered AD post on 20-6-2002. However, the same has not been received back after service or otherwise in such circumstances, presumption is available that the notice must have been served upon the petitioner in the ordinary course of business of P&T Department and more when 30 days have elapsed since then. Today neither the petitioner is present in person nor is represented by duly authorised agent. Accordingly, the reference is liable to be answered in negative owing to default in appearance on behalf of the petitioner and there being no material on record in support of the terms of the reference. Ordered accordingly. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate Government for its publication in the official gazette.

Announced 29-7-2002.

Seal.

V. K. SHARMA
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. : 70 of 1999

Instituted on: 8-4-1999.

Decided on: 30-7-2002.

Shri Bhim Singh son of Shri Chanu Ram, resident of
Village Ajag Chanalda, P. O. Deegarminar, Tehsil
Pachhad, District Sirmour, H. P. .. *Petitioner.*

Versus

1. The Secretary, Horticulture Department, with
HQs. at Shimla.

2. The Director of Horticulture with HQs. at Shimla.

3. The Horticulture Development Officer, Rajgrah,
District Sirmour (H. P.) .. *Respondents.*

*Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes
Act, 1947.*

For petitioner: Shri A. K. Gupta, Advocate.

For respondent: *Ex-parte.*

AWARD

The present petition arise out of the following reference made by the appropriate Government:—

"1. Whether the termination of the service of Shri Bhim Singh, Ex-Beldar by the Horticulture Development Officer, Rajgrah, District Sirmour (H. P.) *w.e.f.* 5-7-91 without any notice, chargesheet; enquiry and without compliance of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, on completion of more than 240 days continuous service, is legal and justified. If not, to what relief of

service benefits and amount of compensation, Shri Bhim Singh is entitled ?"

"2. Whether Shri Bhim Singh has abandoned the service on his own, as alleged. If so, its effect ?"

2. In brief, the case of the petitioner is that he worked as daily beldar with the respondent for the last 10 years immediately preceding 5-7-1991, when his services were terminated in violation of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (The Act). According to the petitioner, he had completed service of more than 240 days on the date of his disengagement. The termination is also said to be in violation of the principles of "last come first go" as persons junior to him are still continuing on the rolls of the respondents and even fresh recruitment has been made thereafter. It is lastly alleged by the petitioner that he approached the concerned authorities to re-engage him, but without any result.

3. On being served with notice of the petition, the respondents put in appearance on 8-6-1999 and 1-9-1999 through their authorised representatives, Shri Gulab Singh and Shri Balku Mal, respectively. However, since none appeared on behalf of the respondents on 3-12-1999, they are proceeded against *ex parte*.

4. In the *ex-parte* evidence led on behalf of the petitioner, he has appeared as his own witness as PW-1. He has stated on oath that he was employed as beldar in Horticulture Office, at Bagthan in 1981. According to him, he left the job in 1991. However, in the very next breath, he has hastened to add that he did not leave the job himself and instead his services were terminated without notice and without payment of any compensation. The petitioner goes on to state that he had completed 240 days service in each year from 1981 onwards. It is lastly stated by him that the persons working with him and those engaged thereafter have been regularised. He has prayed for re-instatement.

5. I have heard the *ex-parte* arguments and gone through the record.

6. The averments made by the petitioner in the petition and duly reiterated by him on oath in his testimony as PW-1 remain absolutely un-rebutted. On being served with notice of the petition, the respondents initially put in appearance in this Court, but later on chose not to appear and contest the petition for the reasons best known to them. In such circumstances, it shall not be unsafe to draw the inference that they do not have any defence to make out.

7. The petitioner has stated on oath that he had completed 10 years of service when the same was terminated on 5-7-1991 without notice and without payment of compensation. It is further stated by him that he had completed more than 240 days of service during each year from 1981 onwards. Thus, according to him, the termination is violative of the provisions of Section 25-F of the act.

8. There is merit in the contention which deserves to be upheld for the reason that neither notice under sub-clauses (a) & (c) of Section 25 of the Act were served upon the petitioner and the appropriate Government, respectively nor compensation under clause (b) of the said section was paid to him despite the petitioner being in continuous service for the statutory period as envisaged under Section 25-B of the Act.

9. In view of the above, the petitioner is entitled for re-instatement in service on and w. e. f. the date of reference i. e. 6-4-1999. However, in the facts and circumstances of the case, he shall be entitled to back wages. The reference stands answered in the above terms. Let a copy of the award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court this the 30th day of July, 2002.

Seal

V. K. SHARMA,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 16/2000.

Smt. Reena Devi.

Versus

Shri Sudhir Mahindroo, Prop. M/S Saroj Hosier
Chambaghat, District Solan, H. P.

31-7-2002—*Present*:—None for petitioner.

Ms. Pama Devi, Advocate *vice* counsel for Respondent.

Case called twice, but none has appeared on behalf of the petitioner. It is 11.40 A. M. The case kept for waiting so as to be called again in the afternoon.

31-7-2002—*Present*:—As above.
(Afternoon).

Case called twice again. However, none has put appearance on behalf of the petitioner. It is already 3.30 p. m. Accordingly the petition is dismissed for default in appearance on behalf the petitioner and the reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette.

Announced 31-7-2002.

Seal.

V. K. SHARMA,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 55 of 1998.

Instituted on 12-6-98.

Decide on 31-7-2002.

1. Mohan Lal son of Shri Devi Ram.

2. Shri Bhim Dutt son of Shri Paras Ram.

.. *Petitioners.*

Versus

1. The H. P. S. E. B. through its Secretary, with headquarters at Shimla.

2. The Executive Engineer, HPESB, Division, Rajgarh, District Sirmour (H.P.). .. *Respondents.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioners: Shri A. K. Gupta, Advocate and Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, AR.

For respondent: Shri Baldev Raj Thakur, AR.

AWARD

The present petition arises out of the following reference made by the appropriate Government:—

"क्या श्री मोहन लाल तथा श्री भीम दत्त को अधिशासी अभियन्ता हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड, राजगढ़ मण्डल, राजगढ़ द्वारा उक्त कामगरो को सेवाएं क्रमशः 21-3-1985 व 21-9-1994 से बिना

किसी नोटिस एवं सेवा लाभों के समाप्त करना उचित एवं न्याय संगत है ? यदि नहीं तो उक्त कामगार किन-किन सेवा लाभों व अधिकारों के पात्र है।"

2. It is averred that the two petitioners, S/Shri Mohan Lal and Bhim Dutt were engaged as daily wage beldar in HPSEB Division, Rajgarh in 1982 and 1990, respectively. Their services were dispensed with on 21-3-1985 and 21-9-1994, respectively. It is alleged that the termination was violative of the Certified Standing Orders framed by respondent No. 2 and Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Hereinafter referred to as the 'Act'). While disengaging the petitioners, persons junior to them were allowed to continue and even fresh recruitment was made thereafter. According to the petitioners, their grievances were not redressed by the respondent despite repeated visits and representations.

3. The respondents have contested the petition by raising legal objections regarding cause of action, maintainability and delay and laches.

4. On merits, it is stated that petitioner No. 1 Mohan Lal worked as daily wage beldar from 1-1-1980 to 20-3-1985 as per mandays chart Annexure R-1. Petitioner No. 2 Bhim Dutt was engaged as daily wage beldar on 16-12-89 and worked as such upto July, 1994, but with lot of interruptions as per man days chart Annexure R-2. Both the petitioner did not complete 240 days service in a calendar year. Their services were not terminated and instead they themselves abandoned the job. It being so, there was no violation either of the provisions of Certified Standing Orders or the Act. No representation, oral or in writing, was ever made by the petitioners to the respondents.

5. On the above pleadings, the following issues were settled by my learned predecessor on 10-12-1998 :-

1. Whether the termination of the petitioner is illegal in view of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ? If so, its effect? ... OPP.
2. Relief.

6. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter, my findings on the above issues are as under :-

Issue No. 1. Yes.

Issue No. 2. Reference answered accordingly vide operative part of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

7. *Issue No. 1.*—It is evident from Annexure-I to the reply filed by respondents that petitioner No. 1 Mohan Lal had put in the requisite service of 240 days during the period 21-3-84 to 20-3-85, that is, twelve calendar months preceding the date of disengagement on 21-3-85. According to him his services were terminated. There is no credible evidence to show that he had abandoned the job. Thus, he is entitled for protection of Section 25-F of the Act.

8. Though the case of petitioner No. 2 Bhim Dutt is not covered under Section 25-F of the Act for want of requisite service of 240 days during the material time, yet he is also entitled for relief as in his case, there is violation of sub-clause (2) of clause 14 of the Certified Standing Orders framed by the respondent. Board in as much as neither 10 days notice was issued to him nor he was paid 'pay and allowances' in lieu of such notice. Further more, he has also asserted that his services were terminated and the respondents have not been able to show that he had abandoned the job. Mandays chart Ex. P-2 goes to show that petitioner No. 2 Bhim Dutt had been working with the respondents even prior to 16-12-1989, that is, the date stated in Annexure-II to the reply.

9. In view of the above discussion, it is held that the termination of services of the petitioners is violative of Section 25 of the Act. The issue is decided accordingly.

RELIEF

10. In the result, the petitioners are entitled for reinstatement in service with seniority and continuity in service on and with effect from the date of reference, that is, 9-6-98. However, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, they shall not be entitled to back wages. Ordered accordingly.

11. The reference stands answered in the above terms. Let a copy of the award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today this the 31st day of July, 2002.

Seal

V. K. SHARMA.

*Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.*

**In the Court of V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court/ Shimla**

Ref. No 249 of 1998.

Instituted on. 28-10-1998.

Decided on 31-7-2002.

Shri Hira Singh s/o Shri Kalu r/o, Village Bari, P. O. Nainidhar, Tehsil Shillai, District Sirmaur H. P.

Guman Singh son of Shri Meru, r/o Village Charwa, P. O. Jukhandon Tehsil Shillai, District Sirmaur, H. P.

Ran Singh son of Shri Sibya Ram, r/o Village Dharwa, P. O. Jukhandon, Tehsil Shillai, District Sirmaur, H. P.

Prem Singh son of Shri Kumbia Ram, r/o Bouch, P. O. Koti Bouch, Tehsil Shillai, District Sirmaur, H. P.
... *Petitioners.*

Versus

The State of H. P. through the Secretary (FWD) with headquarters' at Shimla.

The Superintending Engineer, HPPWD Circle, Nahan, District Sirmaur, H. P.

The Executive Engineer, PWD (B&R) Division, Shillai, District Sirmaur, H. P.
... *Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioner: Shri A. K. Gupta, Advocate.

For respondent: Shri S. P. S. Jaswal, AR.

AWARD

The present petition arise out of the following reference made by the appropriate Government :-

"कि रक्षा श्री हीरा सिंह पुत्र श्री कालू तथा तीन अन्य श्रमिक (संलग्न सूचि अनुसार) को अधिशासी अभियन्ता, हि 0 प्र 0 लोक निर्माण विभाग मण्डल, शिलाई, जिला सिरमौर द्वारा बिना किसी नोटिस व मुआसजा दिए बिना नौकरी से निष्काशना उचित एवं न्यायायुक्त है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त श्रमिक किन सेवा लाभों व अधिकारों के पात्र है।"

In brief, the facts pleaded by the parties can be stated thus. It is averred that the petitioners namely S/Shri Hira Singh, Guman Singh, Ran Singh and Prem Singh were engaged by the respondents as daily wage Beldars in January, 88, November, 88, May, 88 and July, 88,

respectively. They continued as such up to June, 1990. They had completed more than 240 days of statutory service as envisaged under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'The Act'). It is alleged by the petitioners that their services were dispensed with by the respondents in violation of Section 25-F of the Act. The principle of 'last come first go' was also not adhered to. In so much as persons junior to them are still continuing on the rolls of the respondents and even fresh recruitment has taken place since their disengagement from service. In nut-shell the case of the petitioners is that their services were terminated by the respondents in an arbitrary and unjustified manner, and they are entitled for re-instatement with all the consequential benefits including seniority and back wages.

The respondent have contested the petition. They have raised legal objections regarding maintainability and limitation. On merits, it is admitted that the petitioners were engaged as daily wage beldars during January, 88, November, 88 May, 88 and July, 88 respectively. However, it is averred that they were engaged against a particular targeted work for which funds were available at the given time. On completion of the work, their services were no longer required. It is alleged that whereas petitioners No. 2 and 4 namely S/Shri Guman Singh and Prem Singh had voluntarily abandoned the job, petitioners No. 1 and 3 namely S/Shri Hira Singh and RanSingh did not fulfil there requirement of Section 25-B of the Act. It being so, it was not incumbent upon the respondents to either serve any notice upon the petitioners or to pay any compensation to him. It is lastly that on completion of the work, retrenchment was necessary and the petitioners are not entitled for re-engagement.

On the above pleading s, the following issues were settled by my learned predecessor on 13-0-2002:

Whether the petitioners have been illegally Terminated from service in violation of law ? OPP.

Whether the petition is bad in view of preliminary Objections of Respondents. OPR.

Relief

The parties have led evidence. I have heard their learned counsel/representative and gone through record.

For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter, my findings on the above issues are as under :—

FINDINGS

Issue No. 1	Partly Yes.
Issue No. 2	No.
Issue No. 3	Reference dispensed of Accordingly vide operative Part of the record.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1.—Out of petitioners, whereas petitioner No. 1 Shri Hira Singh has entered the witness box as PW-1, the remaining petitioners namely S/Shri Guman Singh, Ran Singh and Prem Singh have tendered in evidence their affidavits which are P-1, P-2 and P-3. Petitioner No. 1 Shri Hira Singh while appearing as PW-1 has stated on oath that he joined PWD in 1988 and his services were terminated in February, 90 by issuance of a notice. Such notices were served upon others. According to him, all of them had completed more than 240 days in the calendar year. Though notices were served, no compensation was paid alongwith the same. It is asserted that neither he nor the co-petitioners left the job on their own. Their co-workers S/Shri Nata Ram, Prem and Relu Ram are still continuing on

the rolls of the respondents and even fresh recruitment was made in 1990 itself.

In cross-examination, PW-1 Shri Hira Singh has deposed that neither he represented to the Department for re-engagement nor he was called by the Department for re-employment. Compensation was claimed by him orally and not in writing. It is denied that petitioners Guman Singh and Prem Singh left the job on their own and as such no notice was served upon them. It is also denied that they had not worked for 240 days in the calendar year.

By filing affidavits, the remaining petitioners namely S/Shri Guman Singh, Ran Singh, and Prem Singh have affirmed the pleading set up by them in the petition.

On behalf of the respondents, Respondent No. 3 Shri Rakesh Gupta has app eard as RW-1. It is stated by him that the petitioners were employed by the Department. They worked as per mandays chart Ex. R-1 prepared on the basis of official record. Services of the petitioners S/Shri Hira Singh and Ran Singh were retrenched w. e. f. 1-6-1990 as per notice s Ex. R-2 and Ex. R-3. The remaining two petitioners abandoned the job themselves in February, 1990. In cross-examination, RW-1 Shri Rakesh Gupta has admitted that petitioners Shri Hira Singh and Shri Ran Singh were not paid retrenchment compensation. There are no remarks in the muster roll except that petitioners Guman Singh and Prem Singh have been marked absent, to show that they had abandoned the job themselves. It is further deposed that they have been coming and going in between. It is admitted that they were not served with notices calling upon them to join duty, failing which their services would be terminated. The witness who joined as Executive Engineer, HPPWD (B&R), Division, Shillai in August, 2001 has lastly stated that no fresh recruitment is being made against the vacancies arising on account of retirement.

Mandays chart Ex. R-1 has been produced and proved by the Respondent s. It goes to show that petitioner No. 1 Shri Hira Singh had put in the requisite service of more than 240 days during the calendar year preceding termination of his service w. e. f. 30-6-1990. Though statutory notice Ex. R-2 was served upon him, the fact remains that retrenchment compensation was not paid to him under Sub-Clause (b) of Section 25-F of the Act. It being so, the termination *qua* him is bad in the eyes of law.

In so far as petitioner No. 4 Shri Prem Singh is concerned, he had also completed the requisite continuous service as is apparent from the entry at Sl. 4 of the mandays chart Ex. R-1. However, he was neither served with any notice nor was paid retrenchment compensation. Thus the termination *qua* his is also bad under Section 25-F of the Act.

The case of petitioner No. 2 Guman Singh does not fall within the purview of the Act. He had not completed the requisite continuous service entitling him for protection under Section 25-F of the Act.

Though petitioner No. 3 Shri Ran Singh was served with notice Ex. R-3, the fact remains that he had also not put in the requisite continuous service of more than 240 days and was thus not entitled for protection under Section 25-F of the Act.

The above discussion leads me to hold that whereas petitioner No. 1 Shri Hira Singh and petitioner No. 4 Shri Prem Singh are entitled for relief, petitioner No. 2 Guman Singh and petitioner No. 3 Shri Ran Singh do not fulfil the requirement of requisite service under Section 25-F of the Act so as to entitle them for grant of relief. The issue is decided accordingly.

Issue No. 2.—The respondent did not press this issue during arguments. Even otherwise, it is not made out as to how the petition is not maintainable. It is settled that law of limitation does not apply to the present

proceedings. Accordingly the issue is held in the negative.

RELIEF

In the result, termination of services of petitioner No. 1 Shri Hira Singh and petitioner No. 4 Prem Singh is held to be illegal and unjustified. Consequently, they are entitled for re-instatement. However, in the facts and circumstances of the case, they shall not be entitled for back wages and the benefits of continuity of service shall be available to them only from the date of reference i. e. 1-8-1998. In so far as petitioner No. 2 Shri Guman Singh and petitioner No. 3 Shri Ran Singh are concerned, they are not entitled for any relief. The reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of the award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court this the 31st day of July, 2002.

Seal

V. K. SHARMA,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. : 116 of 2000

Instituted on : 9-8-2000

Decided on : 31-7-2002

1. Shri Jagat Singh son of Shri Sahib Ram.
2. Shri Bahadur Singh son of Shri Kalia Ram.
3. Shri Rai Singh son of Shri Kanshi Ram.
4. Shri Gulab Singh son of Shri Lal Singh.
5. Shri Kanwar Singh son of Shri Nanta Ram.
6. Shri Zaiti Ram son of Shri Ran Singh.
7. Shri Sunder Singh son of Shri Rai Man.
8. Shri Bahadur Singh son of Shri Gulab Singh.
9. Shri Chria Ram son of Shri Budhia Ram.
10. Shri Sant Ram son of Shri Kambia Ram.
11. Shri Chamel Singh son of Shri Dhian Singh

.. Petitioners.

Versus

1. State of H. P. through Secretary (PWD), with
HQs at Shimla.

2. The Executive Engineer, HPPWD Division,
Shillai .. Respondents.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes
Act, 1947.

AWARD

The present petition arises out of the following reference made by the appropriate Government :—

1. "Whether termination of services of Shri Jagat Singh and 10 others workers (As per list enclosed) by the Executive Engineer, HPPWD, Division, Shillai, District Sirmaur, H. P., without any notice, Chargesheet, enquiry and without compliance of Section 25 (F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on completion of 240 days' continuous service is legal and justified. If not, to what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation, the aggrieved workmen are entitled?"
2. "Whether the workers have abandoned the job on their own, as alleged. If not, to what effect?"

2. The petitioners have filed a joint statement of claim. According to them, they were serving as workmen in the HPPWD Division, Shillai on daily wages as

per the following details regarding their engagement and disengagement :—

Sl. No.	Name	Date of engagement	Date of disengagement.
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri Jagat Singh	1983	1991
2.	Shri Bahadur Singh		8/1989
3.	Shri Rai Singh	1988	9/1989
4.	Shri Gulab Singh	1988	3/1990
5.	Shri Kanwar Singh	1989	2/1990
6.	Shri Jati Ram	1985	3/1989
7.	Shri Sunder Singh	1986	3/1990
8.	Shri Bahadur Singh	1988	4/1989
9.	Shri Chnia Ram	1988	6/1990
10.	Shri Sant Ram	1988	6/1990
11.	Shri Chamel Singh	1988	6/1990

3. It is averred by the petitioners that each of them had completed 240 days of service for the purpose of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. (Hereinafter referred to as 'The Act'). Whereas, petitioners No. 1 to 8 were disengaged without serving any notice and without payment of compensation, one month's notice was issued to the remaining petitioners (9 to 11), but without payment of any compensation. It is further averred that the petitioners were disengaged despite availability of work. Even the principle of 'last come first go' was not adhered to. In as much as, persons junior to the petitioners are still continuing on the rolls of the respondents who have also resorted to fresh recruitment. It is alleged that termination of the services of the petitioners is unjustified, arbitrary and violative of the mandatory provisions of the Act. They are entitled to be re-instated in service with all the consequential service benefits such as seniority and full back wages.

4. The respondents have contested the claim. They have raised legal objections regarding maintainability and limitation.

5. On merits, it is stated that the petitioners were engaged as daily wage beldar during January, 1980, March, 1983, November, 1985, January, 1988, March, 1988, July, 1988 and August, 1988 for completion of a particular targeted work for which funds were available at the given time. On completion of the said work, services of the petitioners were no longer required and as such, services of the petitioners 9 to 11 namely S/Shri Chnia Ram, Sant Ram and Chamel Singh were dispensed with in accordance with the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act during June, 1990. Though petitioners No. 9 Shri Chnia Ram and petitioner No. 11 Shri Chamel Singh did not complete the legal requirements of Sections 25-B and 25-N of the Act, as such, there was no need either to serve any notice upon them or to pay any compensation to them. It is further stated that petitioner No. 11 to 8 voluntarily abandoned the job. It is averred that petitioners No. 2, 3, 8, 9 and 11 also did not fulfill the requirement of Sections 25-B and 25-N of the Act. It is lastly averred that consequent upon completion of the work, retrenchment of the workmen was necessary.

6. On the pleading of the parties, the following issues were settled by my learned predecessor on 13-6-2001 :—

1. Whether the termination of the petitioner in violation of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act ? OPP.
2. Whether the petitioner have abandoned the job as alleged? OPR.
3. Relief.

The parties have led evidence. I have heard the learned counsel and gone through the record.

For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my findings on the above issues are as under :—

FINDINGS

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 1. Issue No. 1 | Yes. |
| 2. Issue No. 2 | No. |
| 3. Relief | Reference disposed of accordingly <i>vide</i> operative part of the award. |

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issue No. 1 & 2.—Both these issues being interconnected shall be taken up for discussion and decision together. Out of the petitioners, petitioner No. 10 Shri Sant Ram has appeared as PW-1. He has stated on oath that he joined the respondent No. 2 as beldar in January, 1988. His services were terminated in June, 1990. According to the witness, the petitioners numbering 11 were working together on daily wages. They did not leave the job on their own and instead retrenchment notices were served upon him and co-petitioners Chnia Ram, Sant Ram and Chamel Singh, but without payment of any compensation. Services of the remaining petitioners have also been terminated likewise. Copy of the notice served him is Ex. PA. He has also produced Mandays chart PB, *qua* all the petitioners. It is further stated by him that Narain Singh, Mohan Singh and Dharmu who were working alongwith the petitioners are still continuing on the rolls of the respondents, who also resorted to fresh recruitment during 1992-94. In cross-examination, the witness has denied that as per Mandays chart Ex. PB, the petitioners had not put in the requisite service of more than 240 days. It is also denied that 8 of the petitioner had left the job themselves and the remaining were served with notices. Instead the witness has asserted that compensation was not paid.

When statement of petitioner No. 10 Shri Sant Ram was recorded in this Court on 1-9-2001 as PW-1, it was directed that affidavits of the remaining petitioners be filed on the next date with advance copies to the respondents and matter was adjourned to 5-12-2001. However, on that day, the Presiding Officer manning this Court was on tour and accordingly the matter was posted for proper orders on 16-1-2002, when none appeared on behalf of the respondents and accordingly notice was ordered to be issued to them for appearance on 23-4-2002. On that day, though counter affidavits were filed, it appears that affidavits on behalf of the remaining petitioners were not filed and the case was adjourned to 17-6-2002 when respondents' evidence was recorded and the matter was fixed for arguments on 31-7-2002.

8. It is stated by RW-1 Shri Rakesh Gupta that whereas petitioners No. 1 to 8 had abandoned the job themselves, the remaining petitioners (9 to 11) were served with notice in June, 1990. It is further stated by him that mandays chart *qua* the petitioners is Ex. PB. They did not represent to the department. In cross-examination, it is admitted by the witness that though notices were served petitioners S/Shri Chain Ram, Sant Ram and Chamel Singh, compensation was neither offered nor paid to them. There is no other material except entries showing absence in the muster roll to prove that petitioners 1 to 8 abandoned the job. The witness who had joined as Executive Engineer, HPPWD (B&R) Division, Shimla recently was deposing on the basis of the record and was not having any personal knowledge.

9. Without going into the rival contentions in detail, sufficient to say that though notice under sub-clause (a) of Section 25-F of the Act were served upon petitioners No. 9 to 11 namely S/Shri Chnia Ram, Sant Ram and Chamel Singh, yet the fact remains that they were not paid retrenchment compensation as provided under sub-clause (b) of the said section and accordingly, there was non compliance of the mandatory provisions of Section 25-F of the Act. But this aspect shall have no bearing on the case of petitioner No. 3 Chaina Ram

as he had put in requisite service of more than 240 days as is apparent from the entries at Sl. No. 9 of Mandays chart Ex. RB.

10. The case of petitioner No. 5 Shri Kanwar Singh is also not hit under Section 25-F of the Act as he had also not put in the requisite service of more than 240 days during the preceding calendar year as is reflected from the entries at Sl. No. 5 of the Mandays chart Ex. RB.

11. In so far as the remaining petitioners *i. e.* petitioners No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 namely S/Shri Jagat Singh, Bahadur Singh son of Shri Kalia Ram, Rai Singh, Gulab Singh, Jati Ram, Sunder Singh, Bahadur Singh, Sant Ram, and Chamel Singh are concerned, all of them had put in more than 240 days of requisite service during the relevant period and as such they are entitled for relief as there is no credible evidence to show that they themselves had abandoned the job and instead the evidence of record indicates that their services were retrenched by the respondents without fulfilling mandatory requirements of Section 25-F of the Act. Accordingly, they are also entitled for relief. Issue is decided accordingly.

RELIEF

12. In the result, the petition succeeds *qua* Petitioners No. 1 to 4, 6 to 8, 10 and 11 namely S/Shri Jagat Singh, Bahadur Singh son of Shri Kali Ram, Rai Singh, Gulab Singh, Jati Ram, Sunder Singh, Bahadur Singh, Sant Ram and Chamel Singh consequently, they are entitled for re-instatement. However, in the facts and circumstances of the case, benefit of continuity of service shall accrue to them only from the date of reference *i. e.* 2-8-2000 and they shall not be entitled for back wages. In so far as Petitioners No. 5 and 9 are concerned, they are not entitled for any relief. The reference is answered accordingly. Let copy of the award be sent to appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette.

Announced in the open Court today this the 31st day of July, 2002

Sd/-
(V. K. SHARMA),
Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of S'ri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. 79/99

Shri Tulsi Ram & Others

Versus

The D. F.O. Renuka, Forest Division Renuka, District Sirmaur, H.P.

8-8-2002.—*Present.*—None for petitioner and also for Respondent.

Case called twice. It is 12.05 P.M. It be kept after some time.

8-8-2002.—*Present:* As above.

Case called twice.—It is 3.05 P. M. still none appeared for the petitioner. Therefore, the reference is liable to be answered in negative owing to default in appearance on behalf of the petitioner and there being no material on record in support of the terms of the reference. Ordered accordingly. Let a copy of the order be sent to appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced 8-8-2002.

Sd/-
(V. K. SHARMA),
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

Seal.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla.

Ref. No. 35/2001

Raghubir Singh

Versus

M. D., H. R. T. C., Nahan

8-8-2002:—*Present*.—Shri Raghubir Singh petitioner in person.

Miss Rita Thakur *vice* counsel for the respondent.

The petitioner has moved an application seeking permission to withdraw the petition. He has been made to understand the ensuing consequences. However, he insists that he does not want to prosecute the petition, which may be dismissed as withdrawn and the reference may be answered accordingly. To this effect, statement of the petitioner recorded separately.

In view of the above, the petitioner is permitted to withdraw the petition and the same shall stand dismissed as such. With dismissal of the petition as withdrawn, the reference has become infructuous and is answered accordingly. Let a copy of the order be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced 8-8-2002.

Seal. Sd/-
(V. K. SHARMA),
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court
Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. : 116 of 1999

Instituted on : 28-6-1999

Decided on : 12-8-2002

Surat Ram and 15 others. .. Petitioners.

Versus

1. H. F. State Forest Corporation through its Managing Director, Shimla.

2. Divisional Manager, H. P. State Forest Corporation, Nerwa Division, Tehsil Chopal, District Shimla.

.. Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For Petitioner: Shri Sarwan Dogra, Advocate.

For Respondent: Shri Adarsh Sharma, Advocate.

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:

"Whether the retrenchment of Shri Surat Ram and 14 other workers (as per list enclosed) by the (1) Divisional Manager, forest Corporation, Forest Division, Chopal district Shimla, H.P. and (2) The Managing Director, H.P. State Forest Corporation, Shimla, H.P. vide demand notices dated 3-12-92, 25-11-93 and 26-11-93 after compliance of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 but without compliance of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 without

having regard to the number of workers being more than 100 with the employer, is legal and justified. If not, to what relief of service benefits including back wages, reinstatement, seniority and amount of compensation, the above aggrieved workman are entitled?"

2. The petitioners have filed joint statement of claim. It is averred that they joined the services of the respondent corporation in its Nerwa Division which was carved out of Chopal division in the year, 1989. The respective dates of their engagement and retrenchment have been given in Annexure A-1 to the reference (Ex. PA), which are as follows:—

Sl. No	Name	Date of engagement	Date of Retrenchment
1.	Shri Surat Ram	August, 1989	3-12-1992
2.	Shri Sukh Ram	December, 87	26-11-93
3.	Shri Badri Ram	January, 89	-do-
4.	Shri Balak Ram	August, 87	-do-
5.	Shri Nand Ram	May, 87	-do-
6.	Shri Sabla Ram	January, 88	3-12-1992
7.	Shri Kewal Ram	1-11-87	15-2-93
8.	Shri Bhagat Ram	18-7-86	3-12-92
9.	Shri Hari Singh	10/85	25-11-93
10.	Shri Dai Ram	1-4-87	-do-
11.	Shri Sita Ram	1989	25-11-93
12.	Shri Kirpa Ram	1987	-do-
13.	Shri Padam Singh	November,	8715-2-93
14.	Shri Attar Singh	August, 1985	26-11-93
15.	Shri Kundan Singh	March, 85	December, 93

3. According to the petitioners, they had been working in different jungles/lots/depos of the corporation to guard timber and other properties belonging to the corporation during day and night. On an average, more than 100 workers were engaged in Nerwa Division of the corporation per day continuously for many years. The said division of the corporation is involved in conversion of standing trees into timber and then into standard sizes of logs which are then transported to the road side depots either through manual labour or through floating in rivers/khuds and ultimately to the sale depots of the corporations at Parwanoo and Baddi where it is sold to the general public and the sale proceeds are collected/sent to the Head Office of the corporation at Shimla. This work goes on continuously throughout the year. Thus the work being performed by the corporation is of regular nature.

4. It is further pleaded that services of the petitioners were illegally terminated by the Divisional Manager, Nerwa division by taking recourse to Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act'). Whereas in the facts and circumstances of the case, Section 25-N of the Act was applicable. It is stated that for the purpose of seniority the respondent corporation constitutes one unit. Even the principle of 'last come first go' was also given a go by. The petitioners on account of sheer poverty could not pursue the matter before the appropriate authorities/court under the Act. They also believed that since majority of the other workmen who were simultaneously disengaged were prosecuting their case before the Labour Court, the outcome of the same would also be applicable to them. The resultant delay is bonafide and unintentional. According to the petitioners, being persons similarly situate, benefits of award dated 6-7-1998 passed by this Court in Reference Numbers 23/95, 44/95, 43/96, 46/96, 4/97, and 30 of 1996 may also be extended to them.

5. The respondents have contested the claim. Preliminary objections regarding maintainability, misjoinder causes of action and delay and laches have been raised.

6. On merits, it is admitted that prior to creation of Nerwa Division, the petitioner's were initially engaged by the Divisional Manager, Forest Working Division, Chopal. They were engaged for watch and work of timber in shifts. It is denied that they were performing duties day and night. Continuous engagement of more than 100 workers in Nerwa Division of the corporation per day for many years is admitted. It is also admitted that the corporation is engaged in carrying out the aforesaid activities. However, it is averred that the work is of seasonal nature. There is complete ban on marking of green trees and only salvage marking is being handed over by the Forest Department to the corporation. Regular work is not available for the petitioners as sufficient number of chowkidars senior to them are already working in Forest Working Division, Nerwa.

7. It is denied that the services of the petitioners were terminated illegally and instead it is averred that the same were dispensed within accordance with law on payment of statutory benefits under Section 25-F of the Act. It is further stated that the seniority of daily wagers is being maintained at divisional level as per judgments delivered by Hon'ble High Court of H. P. in CWP No. 190 of 1984, titled Shri Liaq Ram V/s HPSEB and CWP No. 735 of 1985, titled Shri Chuni Lal V/s HPSEB. Though passing of award dated 6-7-98 by this Court in the aforesaid references is admitted, yet it is alleged that the same does not apply to the facts of the present case. It is denied that the petitioners were illegally retrenched. It is also denied that provisions of Section 25-N of the Act apply to the facts and circumstances of the case and not those of section 25-F of the Act.

8. On the above pleading, the following issues were framed by my learned predecessor on 21-6-2000;—

1. Whether there is any violation of Section 25 (N) in the termination of the petitioner. If so, its effect? OPP.
2. Whether the petition is barred by limitation? OPR.
3. Relief.

9. The parties have led evidence. It have heard their learned counsel, and gone through the record.

10. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter, my findings on the above issues are as under :—

- Issue No. 1 yes.
 Issue No. 2 No.
 Issue No. 3 Reference answered accordingly
 vide operative part of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

11. Issue No. 1.—Admittedly the petitioners were retrenched by the respondent corporation under Section 25-F of the Act. However, in view of the evidence on record, the case is covered under Section 25-N of the Act. The reasons to arrive at this conclusion at the very outset are enumerated hereinafter.

12. The petitioner have categorically averred that in view of the nature of operations being carried out by the respondent corporation, the provisions of Chapter-VB of the Act including those of Section 25-N would apply to it being an "industrial establishment" in which not less than 100 workmen were employed on an average per working day in the preceding twelve calendar months. These averments have been categorically admitted on behalf of the respondents vide paras 3 and 4 of the reply. The same have also been reiterated on oath by the petitioner No. 4 Shri Kamal Singh in his deposition as PW-1. Further more, RW-1 Shri Mast Ram has also admitted these aspects of the case in the opening lines of his statement in cross-examination.

13. On the face of categorical admissions both in pleadings and evidence the stand on behalf of the res-

pondent corporation that it is an 'establishment' of a seasonal character or in which work is performed only intermittently or the provisions of section 25-N do not apply to the facts of the case in hand, is totally believed.

14. In view of the above, the retrenchment of the petitioners is held to be violative of section 25-N of the Act due to its total non-compliance. The issue is decided accordingly.

15. Issue No. 2.—The respondents did not press this issue during the course of arguments. Even otherwise it is settled that law of limitation does not apply to these proceedings. The issue is accordingly decided as not pressed.

RELIEF

16. In the result, the reference is answered in affirmative. Consequently the retrenchment of the petitioners is held to be violative of section 25-N of the Act entitling them to re-instatement with continuity in service and seniority on and with effect from the respective dates of their retrenchment. However, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case they shall be entitled for back wages only from the date of reference, that is 8-6-1999. The amount of compensation, if any paid to the petitioners under section 25-F of the Act shall be liable to be adjusted against the amount of back wages.

17. The reference stands answered in the above terms. Let a copy of the award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced in the open Court today this 12th day of August, 2002.

Sd/-
 (V. K. SHARMA,)
 Presiding Judge,
 H.P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
 Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
 H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. : 115 of 1999.

Instituted on : 28-6-1999.

Decided on : 12-8-2002.

Shri Liaq Ram and 5 others. .. Petitioners.

Versus

1. H. P. State Forest Corporation, through its Managing Director. Shimla.

2. Divisional Manager, H. P. State Forest Corporation, Nerwa Division, Tehsil Chopal, District Shimla. .. Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioners: Shri Sarwan Dogra, Advocate.

For respondent: Shri Adarsh Sharma, Advocate.

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:

"Whether the retrenchment of S/Shri Liaq Ram, Gian Singh, Hari Chand, Bhag Mal, Bhamal and Kamal Singh, daily wages workers by (1) Divisional Manager, H. P. State forest Corporation Forest Division, Chopal, District Shimla, H. P. and (2) The Managing Director, H. P. State Forest Corporation, Shimla after compliance of section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 vide notices,

dated 3-12-1992 and 8-4-1997 but without compliance of Section 25-N of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 without having regard to the number of workers being more than 100 with the employer, is legal and justified? If not, what relief of service benefit, including re-instatement, back wages, seniority and amount of compensation, the above aggrieved workmen are entitled to?"

2. The petitioners have filed joint statement of claim. It is averred that they joined the services of the respondent corporation in its Nerwa Division which was carved out of Chopal division in the year 1989. The respective dates of their engagement and retrenchment have been given in Annexure A-1 to the statement of claim (Ex. PB), which are as follows:—

Sl. No.	Name	Date of engagement	Date of retrenchment
1.	Laiq Ram	June, 1987	Feb. 1993/8-4-97
2.	Hari Chand	18-5-1987	-do-
3.	Gian Singh	8-10-1987	-do-
4.	Kamal Singh	August, 84	-do-
5.	Bhag Mal s/o Shri Anant Rani.	May, 87	-do-
6.	Bhag Mal s/o Shri Sukh Ram	9-7-79.	December, 92

3. According to the petitioners, they had been working in different jungles/lots/depots of the corporation to guard timber and other properties belonging to the corporation during day night.

4. It is stated that there are two sets of petitioners in the present reference. The first set comprises of five petitioners namely Laiq Ram, Hari Chand, Gian Singh, Kamal Singh and Bhag Mal son of Shri Anant Ram. They had approached the Hon'ble High Court of H. P. by filing CWP No. 303/1993 and were re-engaged as per order dated 7-4-93 at the same place and in the same capacity. However, they were again disengaged by the respondent corporation on 8-7-1997 when the aforesaid writ petition was dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court on the point of jurisdiction. Consequently, they filed Original Application No. 799/97 in the H. P. Administrative Tribunal on 25-4-1997 which was also later on dismissed as withdrawn on 14-7-98 with liberty reserved to approach the Labour Court. The second set comprises of petitioner Bhag Mal son of Shri Sukh Ram who was also disengaged alongwith the remaining petitioners under Section 25-F of the Act, in December, 1992, but did not approach either the Hon'ble High Court or the Administrative Tribunal.

5. On an average, more than 100 workers were engaged in Nerwa Division of the corporation per day continuously for many years. The said division of the corporation is involved in conversion of standing trees into timber and then into standard sizes of logs which are then transported to the road side depots either through manual labour or through floating in rivers/khuds and ultimately to the sale depots of the corporation at Parwanoo and Baddi, where it is sold to the general public and the sale proceeds are collected/sent to the Head office of the corporation at Shimla. This work goes on continuously throughout the year. Thus, the work being performed by the corporation is of regular nature.

6. It is further pleaded that services of the petitioners were illegally terminated by the Divisional Manager, Nerwa Division by taking recourse to Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act'). Whereas in the facts and circumstances of the case, Section 25-N of the Act was applicable. It is stated that for the purpose of seniority, the respondent corporation constitutes one unit. Even the principle of 'last come first go' was given a go by. The petitioner on

account of sheer poverty could not pursue the matter before the appropriate authorities/court under the Act. They also believed that since majority of other workmen who were simultaneously disengaged were prosecuting their case before the Labour Court, the outcome of the same would also be applicable to them. The resultant delay is bonafide and unintentional. According to the petitioners, being person similarly situated, benefit of award dated 6-7-1998 passed by this Court in Reference Number 23/95, 44/95, 43/96, 46/96, 4/97 and 30 of 1996 may also be extended to them.

7. The respondent have contested the claim. Preliminary objections regarding maintainability, misjoinder of causes of section and delay and a laches have been raised.

8. On merits, it is admitted that prior to creation of Nerwa Division, the petitioners were initially engaged by the Divisional Manager, Forest Working Division, Chopal. They were engaged for watch and ward of timber in shifts. It is denied that they were performing duties day and night. It is admitted that there are two sets of petitioners. Continuous engagement of more than 100 workers in Nerwa Division of the corporation per day for many years is admitted. It is also admitted that the corporation is engaged in carrying out the aforesaid activities. However it is averred that the work is of seasonal nature. There is complete ban on marking of green trees and only salvage marking is being handed over by the Forest Department to the corporation. Regular work is not available for the petitioners as sufficient number of chowkidars senior to them are already working in Forest Division Nerwa.

9. It is denied that the services of the petitioners were terminated illegally and instead it is averred that the same were dispensed within accordance with law on payment of statutory benefits under Section 25-F of the Act. It is further stated that the seniority of daily wage is being maintained at divisional level as per judgements delivered by Hon'ble High Court of H. P. in CWP No. 190 of 1984 titled Shri Laiq Ram v/s HPSEB and CWP No. 735 of 1985, titled Shri Chuni Lal v/s HPSEFC. Though passing of award dated 6-7-98 by this Court in the aforesaid reference is admitted yet it is alleged that the same does not apply to the facts of the present case. It is denied that the petitioners were illegally retrenched. It is also denied that provisions of Section 25-N of the Act apply to the facts and circumstances of the case and not those of Section 25-F of the Act.

10. On the above pleading, the following issues were framed by my learned predecessor on 21-6-2000:—

1. Whether there is any violation of Section 25 (N) in the termination of the petitioner. If so, its effect? OPP.

2. Whether the petition is barred by limitation? OPR.

3. Relief.

11. The parties have led evidence. I have heard their learned counsel and gone through the record.

12. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter my findings on the above issues are as under:—

Issue No. 1. Yes.

Issue No. 2. No.

Issue No. 3. Reference answered accordingly vide operative part of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

13. Issue No. 1. Admittedly, the petitioners were retrenched by the respondent corporation under Section 25-F of the Act. However in view of the evidence on record, the case is covered under Section 25-N of the Act. The reasons to arrive at this conclusion at the very outset are enumerated hereinafter.

14. The petitioners have categorically averred that in view of the nature of operations being carried out by the respondent corporation, the provisions of Chapter-VB of the Act including those of Section 25-N would apply to it being an "Industrial Establishment" in which not less than 100 workmen were employed on an average per working day in the preceding twelve calendar months. These averments have been categorically admitted on behalf of the respondents *vide* paras 3 and 4 of the reply. The same have also been reiterated on oath by petitioner No. 4 Shri Kamal Singh in his deposition as PW-1. Further more RW-1 Shri Mast Ram has also admitted these aspects of the case in the opening lines of his statement in cross-examination.

15. On the face of categoric admissions, both in pleadings and evidence, the stand on behalf of respondent corporation that it is an 'establishment' of a seasonal character or in which work is performed only intermittently or the provisions of section 25-N do not apply to the facts of the case in hand, is totally believed.

16. In view of the above, the retrenchment of the petitioners is held to be violative of Section 25-N of the Act due to its total non-compliance. The issue is decided accordingly.

17. *Issue No. 2.*—The respondents did not press this issue during the course of arguments. Even otherwise, it is settled that law of limitation does not apply to these proceedings. The issue is accordingly decided as not pressed.

RELIEF

18. In the result, the reference is answered in affirmative. Consequently the retrenchment of the petitioners is held to be violative of Section 25-N of the Act. Since all the petitioners except petitioner No. 6 Shri Bhag Mal son of Shri Sukh Ram had been espousing their cause immediately after their retrenchment, first in the Hon'ble High Court of H. P., then in H. P. Administrative Tribunal and ultimately in this Court, they shall be entitled for re-instatement with continuity in service, seniority and back wages on and with effect from the respective dates of their retrenchment. However, back wages shall not be payable to them for the intervening period during which they were re-instated in service as per orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court.

19. Petitioner No. 6 Shri Bhag Mal son of Shri Sukh Ram shall be entitled to re-instatement with continuity in service and seniority on and with effect from the date of his retrenchment. However, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case *qua* him, he shall be entitled for back wages only from the date of reference, that is 8-6-99.

20. The amount of compensation, if any, paid to the petitioners under section 25-F of the Act shall be liable to be adjusted against the amount of back wages.

21. The reference stands answered in the above terms. Let a copy of the award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today this 12th day of August, 2002.

Seal. (V. K. SHARMA),
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of Sh. V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. : 114 of 1999.
Instituted No. : 28-6-1999.
Decided on : 12-8-2002.

Shri Sunil Dutt Petitioner.
Versus

2. Divisional Manager, H. P. State Corporation,
Chopal Division, Tehsil Chopal, District Shimla.
Respondent.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial
Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioner : Shri Sarwan Dogra, Advocate.

For respondents : Shri Adarsh Sharma, Advocate.

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate government:—

"Whether the retrenchment of Sh. Sunil Dutt Sharma, Worker (daily wages) by (1) Divisional Manager, H. P. State Forest Corporation, Forest Division, Chopal, Distt. Shimla, H. P. and (2) The Managing Director, H. P. State Forest Corporation, Shimla *w.e.f.* 22-7-92 after compliance of Section 25(F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 but without compliance of Section 25(N) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 without having regard to the number of workers being more than 100 with the employer, is legal and justified. If not, to what relief of service benefits including back wages, reinstatement, seniority and amount of compensation, Sh. Sunil Dutt Sharma is entitled?"

2. The petitioner has filed the statement of claim it is averred that he joined the respondent corporation in its Forest Division at Chopal on daily wages in July, 1991 and was illegally retrenched on 22-7-92. He had put in 240 days in twelve calendar months preceding the date of retrenchment. Though he worked in the said corporation upto 31-10-92, but was not paid wages after July, 1992. According to the petitioner, he had been working in different jungles/lots depots of the corporation to guard timber and other properties belonging to the corporation during day and night. On an average, more than 100 workers were engaged in Chopal Division of the Corporation per day continuously for many years. The said division of the corporation is involved in conversion of standing trees into timber and then into standard sizes of logs which are then transported to the road side depots either through manual labour or through floating in rivers/khuds and ultimately to the sale depots of the corporation at Parwanoo and Baddi, where it is sold to the general public and the sale proceeds are collected/ sent to the Head office of the corporation at Shimla. This work goes on continuously through out the year. It involves both government and private forests. Thus, the work being performed by the corporation is of regular nature.

3. It is further pleaded that services of the petitioner were illegally terminated by the Divisional Manager, Chopal Division by taking recourse to Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act'). Whereas in the facts and circumstances of the case, Section 25-N of the Act was applicable. It is stated that for the purpose of seniority, the respondent corporation constitutes one unit. Even the principle of 'last come first go' was also given a go by. The petitioner on account of sheer poverty could not pursue the matter before the appropriate authorities/court under the Act. He also believed that since majority of other workmen who were simultaneously disengaged were prosecuting their case before the Labour Court, the outcome of the same would also be applicable to him. The resultant delay is bonafide and unintentional. According to the petitioner, being a person similarly situate, benefit of award dated 6-7-1998 passed by this Court in Reference Numbers 23/95, 44/95, 43/96, 46/96, 4/97 and 30 of 1996 may also be extended to him.

4. The respondents have contested the claim. Preliminary objections regarding maintainability, delay and laches and estoppel have been raised.

5. On merits, it is admitted that the petitioner worked with the corporation on daily wages from July.

1. H.P. State Forest Corporation through its
Managing Director, Shimla.

1991 to 22-7-92 and had completed 240 days in twelve calendar months preceding the date of retrenchment. However, it is denied that his services were terminated illegally and instead it is averred that the same were dispensed with in accordance with law. The petitioner was duly served with notice under Section 25-F of the Act and was also paid retrenchment compensation. The services had to be dispensed with owing to cessation of work. The seniority of daily wage workers is maintained at the divisional level and the principle of 'last come first go' was followed. It is further stated that though there was no work for the petitioner after he was retrenched, yet he kept on reporting for duty upto 31-10-92 and the officials on the spot were not aware about his retrenchment. Thus he is not entitled for wages for this period. The nature of duties being performed by the petitioner is admitted. Continuous engagement of more than 100 workers in Chopal Division of the corporation per day continuously for many years is denied and instead it is stated that number of workers depends upon availability of work. It is admitted that the Corporation is engaged in carrying out the aforesaid activities. However, it is averred that the work is of seasonal nature. It is not a continuing process. Some times, private contractors are also engaged who employ their own labour. Though passing of award dated 6-7-98 by this Court in the aforesaid references is admitted, yet it is alleged that the same does not apply to the facts of the present case. It is denied that the petitioner was illegally retrenched. It is also denied that provisions of Section 25-N of the Act apply to the facts and circumstances of the present case and not those of Section 25-F of the Act.

6. On the above pleadings, the following issues were framed by my learned predecessor on 21-6-2000:—

1. Whether there is any violation of Section 25(N) in the termination of the petitioner, if so, its effect? OPP.

2. Whether the petition is barred by limitation? OPR

3. Relief.

7. The parties have led evidence. I have heard their learned counsel and gone through the record.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter, my findings on the above issues are as under:—

Issue No. 1 Yes.

Issue No. 2 No.

Issue No. 3. Reference answered accordingly vide operative part of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

9. Issue No. 1.—Admittedly the petitioner was retrenched by the respondent corporation under Section 25-F of the Act. However, in view of the evidence on record, the case is covered under Section 25-N of the Act. The reasons to arrive at this conclusion at the very outset are enumerated hereinafter.

10. The petitioner has categorically averred that in view of the nature of operations being carried out by the respondent corporation, the provisions of Chapter-VB of the Act including those of Section 25-N would apply to it being an 'Industrial establishment' in which not less than 100 workmen were employed on an average per working day in the preceding twelve calendar months. Though the respondents have admitted the nature of operations in which the corporation is engaged, yet it is denied that either more than 100 workers were engaged at any given time as alleged of the work is of continuous nature. Instead it is pleaded that the work is of seasonal nature and number of workers depends upon availability of work. However RW-1 Shri Som Dutt Sharma has admitted in no unambiguous terms

that more than 100 workers were employed in 1992 and the operations being carried out by the corporation continue throughout the year. This part of his statement belies the stand on behalf of the respondent corporation that it is an 'establishment' of a seasonal character or in which work is performed only intermittently or the provisions of Section 25-N of the Act do not apply to the facts of the case in hand.

11. In view of the above, the termination of the petitioner is held to be violative of Section 25-N of the Act due to its total non-compliance. The issue is decided accordingly.

12. Issue No. 2.—The respondents did not press this issues during the course of arguments. Even otherwise, it is settled that law of limitation does not apply to these proceedings. The issue is accordingly decided as not pressed.

RELIEF

13. In the result the reference is answered in the affirmative. Consequently retrenchment of the petitioner is held to be violative of Section 25-N of the Act entitling him to re-instatement with continuity in service and seniority on and with effect from the date of retrenchment, that is 22-7-92. However in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, he shall be entitled for back wages only from the date of reference that is 8-6-99. The amount of compensation, if any, paid to the petitioner under Section 25-F of the Act shall be liable to be adjusted against the amount of back wages.

14. The reference stands answered in the above terms. Let a copy of the award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today this 12th day of August, 2002.

Seal. (V. K. SHARMA),
Presiding Judge.
H.P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. : 217/98.1
Instituted on : 14-10-98.
Decided on : 12-8-2002.

1. Shri Bala Ram s/o Shri Hirda Ram, 2. Shri Mohd. Yunus s/o Sh. Hirda Ram, 3. Shri Bir Singh s/o Sh. Purnu Ram, 4. Shri Jagdish Chand s/o Sh. Ram Saroop, 5. Shri Ram Kisan s/o Shri Mata Ram, 6. Shri Jai Singh s/o Shri Amar Singh, 7. Shri Prithvi Singh s/o Shri Abu Ram, 8. Shri Amar Singh s/o Sh. Bal Krishan .. Petitioners.

Versus

1. State of H.P. through Secy. (PWD) with headquarters at Shimla, 2. The Superintending Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Circle (12 Circle) Nahan. 3. The Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Division, Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmaur, H.P. .. Respondents.

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioners : Shri A. K. Gupta, Advocate.

For respondents : Shri Mohinder Singh, AR.

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate Government.

"कि क्या बाला राम व अन्य श्रमिकों को नियोजक अधिशाही अधिन्यता, हि० प्र० लोक निर्माण विभाग, पावटा साहिब द्वारा

लगातार 240 दिनों से अधिक की सेवाएं करने उपरान्त तथा औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 25-एफ के प्रावधानों का अनुपालन किए बिना (संलग्न सूचि अनुसार) लिखि से समाप्त करना उचित एवं न्यायसंगत है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त श्रमिक किन सेवा लाभों व क्षतिपूर्ति के हकदार हैं?"

2. The petitioners have filed joint statement of claim. It is averred that they were serving the respondent department on daily wages. It is stated that the respective dates of their engagement and disengagement have been given in Annexure P-1 to the statement of claim, but no such annexure has been appended therewith. However, as per list of workmen annexed with the reference, the respective dates of their engagement and disengagement are as follows :—

Sl. No.	Name	Date of engagement	Date of disengagement
1.	Sh. Bala Ram	11/80	4/87
2.	Sh. Mohd. Yunus	1/85	5/86
3.	Sh. Bir Singh	2/80	1989
4.	Sh. Jagdish Chand	1/80	2/84
5.	Sh. Ram Krishan	11/87	8/88
6.	Sh. Jai Singh	11/83	11/84
7.	Sh. Prithvi Singh	12/80	5/84
8.	Sh. Amar Singh	6/87	4/93

3. According to the petitioners, they had completed more than 240 days of service as envisaged in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act'). Even despite that their services were dispensed with in violation of Section 25-F of the Act. While dispensing with the services of the petitioners, persons junior to them were allowed to continue and the principle of 'last come first go' was not followed. Even fresh recruitment has taken place thereafter.

4. The respondents have contested the claim. Preliminary objections regarding maintainability, limitation and estoppel have been raised.

5. On merits, engagement of the petitioners on daily wages is admitted. It is stated that as per mandays chart Ex. RW/A, no other petitioner except petitioners No. : 2, 5 and 6, completed 240 days of continuous service as envisaged under Section 25 B(2) (a) (ii) of the Act. It is further stated that petitioner No. 8, namely Amar Singh is still on the rolls of the respondent department. It is alleged that this is not a case of retrenchment and instead the petitioners had voluntarily abandoned the job without intimation and any cogent reason and they never reported for work thereafter. It being so, the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act do not apply to the facts and circumstances of the case.

6. On the above pleadings, the following issues were framed by my learned predecessor on 19-5-2000:—

- Whether the services of the petitioners have been terminated illegally, as alleged ? OPP.
- Whether the petition suffers from delay and laches ? If so, its effect ? OPR.
- Relief.

7. The parties have led evidence. I have heard their learned counsel/authorised representative and gone through the record.

For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter, my findings on the above issues are as under :—

Issue No. 1. Partly yes.

Issue No. 2. No.

Issue No. 3 Reference answered accordingly in operative part of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

8. *Issue No. 1.*—It is apparent from mandays chart Ex. RW/A that petitioners No. 2, 5 & 6 namely Mohd. Yunus, Ram Krishan and Jai Singh had put in the requisite service of 240 days during twelve calendar months preceding respective dates of their disengagement. It being so, they are *prima facie*, entitled for relief. According to them, their services were dispensed with by the respondents in violation of Section 25-F of the act. A bare perusal of the statement of RW-1 Shri Naveen Joshi would go to show that the respondents have failed to establish that this is not a case of retrenchment and instead the petitioners had themselves abandoned the job. Accordingly, it is held that retrenchment of petitioners No. 2, 5 & 6, namely Mohd. Yunus, Ram Krishan and Jai Singh is violative of section 25-F of the Act.

9. In so far as petitioners No. 1, 3, 4 & 7, namely Bala Ram, Bir Singh, Jagdish Chand and Prithvi Singh are concerned, without going into the controversy whether their services were dispensed with by the respondents or they themselves had abandoned the job, suffice it to say that their case is not covered under Section 25-F of the Act for want of requisite service of 240 days during the relevant period as is apparent from mandays chart Ex. RW/A. Accordingly, they are not entitled for any relief.

10. There is no dispute that Petitioner No. 8 Amar Singh is still continuing in the employment of the respondent and his name appears to have been included in the reference inadvertently. Thus, the reference *qua* him has been rendered infructuous.

11. The issue is decided accordingly.

12. *Issue No. 2.*—The respondents did not press this issue during the course of arguments. Even otherwise, it is settled that law of limitation does not apply to these proceedings. The issue is accordingly disposed of as not pressed.

RELIEF

13. In the result, the reference is answered partly in affirmative, in, the above terms. Consequently, petitioners No. 2, 5 and 6, namely Mohd. Yunus, Ram Krishan and Jai Singh are held entitled for reinstatement with continuity in service and seniority on and with effect from the date of reference, that is, 14-10-98. However, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, they are not entitled for back wages.

14. The remaining petitioners except petitioner No. 8 Shri Amar Singh who is continuing in the employment of the respondents, are not entitled for any relief.

15. The reference *qua* petitioner No. 8 Amar Singh has been rendered infructuous.

16. The reference stands answered in the above terms. Let a copy of the award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today the 12th day of August, 2002.

Sd/-
(V. K. SHARMA),
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No.: 157/99.

General Secy./President. Himalyan Mazdoor Union,
Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, H. P.

Versus

M/s Himalayan Forest & Agro Products (P) Ltd.,
Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, H. P.

13-8-2002 : *Present*—None.

Case called twice. It is 11.15 A. M. still none has put in appearance on behalf of the parties despite service through registered A. D. post. The petition be kept in waiting so as to be taken up after noon hours.

13-8-2002 : *Present*—None.
(After noon)

Again case called twice. It is 3.30 A. M. None has put in appearance on behalf of either of the parties despite service through Registered A. D. post. Accordingly the reference is answered in negative in default of the appearance of the petitioner. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate Government for its publication in the official gazette.

Announced on 13-8-2002.

Seal. V. K. SHARMA,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 160/98.

Yash Pal *Versus* Rakesh Khurana

14-8-2002—*Present*—Shri Yash Pal petitioner with
Shri A. K. Sharma, AR.

Respondent with Shri Rahul
Mahajan, Advocate, Id. cl.

Pursuant to setting aside of the *ex parte* award dated 8-11-99 passed by my learned predecessor in the present reference, *vide* a separate order of the day passed in MA No. 29/2001, titled as Rakesh Khurana Vs. Yash Pal, the present reference stands restored for disposal on merits. It be registered at its original number.

Conciliation between the parties tried. Efforts succeeded. The respondent is ready and willing to pay a sum of Rs. 35,000/- to the petitioner towards full and final settlement of his claim as involved in the present reference and the proposal is acceptable to the petitioner. To this effect are their statements recorded separately.

In view of amicable settlement arrived at between the parties, it is directed that the respondent shall pay the aforesaid sum of Rs. 35,000/- to the petitioner in this Court on 19-8-2002, failing which the amount shall also carry interest @ 9% P.A. from today till realization and the petitioner shall be entitled to get the amount recovered through process of law.

The reference stands answered in the above terms. Let a copy of the award be sent to appropriate Government for its publication in the H. P. Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Announced on 14-8-2002.

Seal. V. K. SHARMA,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref No. : 37 of 1998
Instituted on : 2-4-1998
Decided on : 16-8-2002.

Ramzan Mohamad (Mason). .. Petitioner.

Versus

The Executive Engineer, HPPWD, Division No. 1
Bilaspur, H. P. .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioner : Shri Sunder Singh, AR.

For respondent : Shri Neel Kamal Chadda.

AWARD

The following reference has been received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:—

“कि क्या श्री रमजान मोहम्मद पुत्र श्री रुकमदीन, दैनिक भोगी मैदान को अधिशासी अभियन्ता, डि० प्र० लोक निर्माण विभाग मण्डल नं० 1 बिलासपुर द्वारा 1-4-1997 से नोकरी से निकाला जाना उचित एवं न्याय संगत है ? यदि नहीं, तो कामगार किस लाभ व राहत का पात्र है ?”

2. The petitioner has filed statement of claim. According to him, he joined the respondent as daily wage Mason on 14-3-1996 and worked as such continuously till 31-3-1997. However, he was terminated/dismissed on 1-4-1997 by an oral order despite completion of 300 days of service. Neither any notice was served upon him nor he was paid retrenchment compensation. His juniors namely Devi Ram, Mansa Ram and Nikka Ram were retained. Even fresh recruitment has taken place thereafter, but he was not re-employed. In nut-shell the grievance raised by the petitioner is that he was retrenched by the respondent in violation of Sections 25-F, 25-G and 25-H of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act').

3. The respondent has contested the claim. It is pleaded that the petitioner was engaged on 15-3-1996. He worked for 181 days during the calendar year 1996, but without continuity and 81 1/2 days in the calendar year, 1997 as per detail of working days given in Annexure R-1 to the reply. It is further averred that the petitioner was engaged to carry out special emergent repairs in the open Air Jail complex at Raghunathpura, Bilaspur. On completion of the work, he was disengaged. Thus, it is neither a case of termination nor retrenchment. He had not completed 300 days of service as alleged. Whereas, Mansa Ram and Devi Ram who were engaged in January, 1993 and May, 1995 were retained being senior to the petitioner, Nikka Ram who was engaged alongwith the petitioner for the specified work as aforesaid was also similarly disengaged on completion of the work. Thus, the petitioner has not been discriminated against. It is further pleaded that the petitioner had not completed 240 days of continuous service. It is denied that any fresh recruitment was made after disengagement of the petitioner.

4. In the rejoinder, the petitioner has refuted the stand on behalf of the respondent and instead reiterated his own case.

5. On the above pleadings, the following issues were framed by my learned predecessor on 13-10-98:—

1. Whether the termination of the petitioner is illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947? If so, its effect ? OPP.

2. Relief.

6. The parties have led evidence. I have heard their authorized representative's and gone through the record.

7. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter, my findings on the above issues are as under:

Issue No. 1. Yes.

Issue No. 2. Reference answered accordingly *vide* operative part of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

8. *Issue No. 1.*—Admittedly, this is a case of disengagement amounting to termination as admitted by RW-1

Shri Balak Ram in the opening lines of his statement. It is evident from Annexure-1 to the reply filed on behalf of the respondent that the petitioner had completed more than 240 days service during the period of twelve calendar months preceding the date of retrenchment, that is, between 1-4-1996 to 31-3-1997. Thus, he was entitled to the protection of Section 25-F of the 'Act'. However, since neither he was served with the statutory one month's notice nor was paid retrenchment compensation, there is complete violation of the said section of the 'Act', entitling the petitioner to relief.

10. The issue is decided accordingly.

RELIEF

11. In the result, the reference is answered in affirmative. Consequently, the petitioner is held entitled for re-instatement with continuity in service and seniority from the date of retrenchment 1-4-1997 with back wages from the date of reference, that is, 27-4-1998.

13. The reference stands answered in the above terms. Let a copy of the award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette in accordance with law.

Announced in the open Court today the 16th day of August, 2002.

Seal.

V. K. SHARMA,

Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. : 156/2002.

Shri Jagat Ram

Versus

Manager, Hotel Le-Royala, Jakhoo Road Near Ridge,
Shimla-171001.

Shri Hem Raj AR for petitioner Union.

16-8-2002—Present—Shri Gopal Khanna, Manager,
AR. for respondent.

Service is complete. It is stated that the parties have entered into an out of Court settlement vide which out of 17 workmen, whereas 16 stand re-instated, the 17th namely Shri Sushil Kumar has been paid a sum of

Rs. 18,000/- as full and final settlement of his claim. To this effect are the statements of Shri Hem Raj, AR. for petitioner Union and Shri Gopal Khanna, Manager of the respondent Hotel recorded separately.

In view of the amicable settlement arrived at between the parties, the dispute between them has come to an end. The reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of the order be sent to appropriate Government of publication.

Announced on 16-8-2002.

Seal.

V. K. SHARMA,

Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. : 51/2000.

Shri Roop Singh

Versus

General Manager, Rasin & Turpentine (R&T) Factory
Nahan, District Sirmaur (H. P.)

23-8-2002:—None for petitioner.

Respondent is already *ex parte*.

Case called twice, but none has appeared on behalf of the petitioner. It is 14.45 A. M. It be kept in waiting so as to be called in the afternoon.

23-8-2002.—Present—As above.

(After noon)

Case called twice again in the light of the light earlier order of the day. However, none has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioner, who has also not filed statement of claim as yet. In such circumstances, the reference is liable to be answered in negative for lack of claim and evidence in support thereof ordered accordingly. Let a copy of the award be sent to appropriate Government for its publication in the H. P. official gazette.

Announced in the open Court.

Seal.

V. K. SHARMA,

Presiding Judge,

H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

भाग-2—वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि

Office of the District Industries Centre, Una, District
Una (H. P.)

NOTICE UNDER SECTION '24'

Una, the 17th March, 1994

No. L/DIO/MM/1861 to 1866.—WHEREAS a notice was served on M/s. A. V. Vasdev Industries, 28Indl. Area, Mehatpur on 17-11-92 under Section 23 of the Himachal Pradesh State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 calling upon said M/s. A. V. Vasdev Industries Mehatpur to pay to me the sum of Rs. 20000/- Principal and Rs. 10% P. A. Intt. before 30-11-92 and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I, hereby declare that the sum of Rs. 20000/- Principal and 19,650/- Intt. with penal interest 10% upto the date of actual deposit, is due from the said M/s. A. V. Vasdev Industries, Mehatpur and that the property

described in the attached schedule is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

SCHEDULE

Moveable and immoveable properties of the followings:—

1. Sh. S. P. Vasdev s/o Sh. M. L. Vasdev, Prop. A. V. Vasdev Industries, 28-Indl. Area Mehatpur.
2. Sh. Inderjit Singh s/o Sh. Harnam Singh, Main Bazar, Una Town, H. P.
3. Sh. Jagdish Chander Sharma s/o Sh. P. N. Sharma Vill. and P. O. Una, H. P.

Sd/-

General Manager,
District Industries Centre,
Una, H. P.

भाग-3—अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाइनैशियल कमिशनर तथा कमीशनर आफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि।

श्रम विभाग

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-1, 16 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-6/85 (लैब) आई० डी० भाग/2002/Shimla.—अधो-हस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Rajender Singh s/o late Shri Anant Ram, Village Kayar, P. O. Kuthar, Tehsil Theog, Distt. Shimla, Himachal Pradesh v/s the Executive Engineer, H. P. State Electricity Board, Division Theog Distt. Shimla. H. P. के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किये गये विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of the services of Shri Rajender Singh s/o Late Sh. Anant Ram w. e. f. 25-5-2000 by the Executive Engineer, H. P. S. E. B. Division Theog, Distt. Shimla, H. P. on completion of emergent work and without complying with the provision of the section 25-F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified. If not, what relief of service benefits including compensation the above workman is entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 18 सितम्बर, 2002

सं० 11-1/86 (लैब०) आई० डी० भाग/Shimla. अधो-हस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Sh. Sunder Singh s/o Late Sh. Bhajan Singh Versus The Executive Engineer, H. P. S. E. B., Division Rajgarh, District Sirmaur, H. P. के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम

न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of the services of Shri Sunder Singh s/o late Shri Bhajan Singh w. e. f. June, 1990 by the Executive Engineer H. P. S. E. B. Division Rajgarh District Sirmaur, H. P. without complying the provisions of section 25-F 25-G and 25-H of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not to what relief of service benefits including seniority and back wages, the above workman is entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 19 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-1/2K (लैब०) आई० डी० भाग-/Shimla-1. अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि H. P. Corporate Sector Workers Co-ordination Committee and The Managing Director, The Himachal Pradesh State Small Industries & Export Corporation Ltd., Kishore Bhawan, The Mall, Shimla-1 के मध्य नीचे दिये गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा 5 के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the demands raised by way of demand notice, dated 18-11-2000 by the General Secretary H.P. Corporate Sector Workers Co-ordination Committee, Kishore Bhawan the Mall Shimla-1. before the managing Director, The Himachal Pradesh State Small Industries and Export Corporation Limited, Kishore Bhawan, The Mall, Shimla, H. P. are justified or un-justified? If justified, what relief and financial benefit, the workers of the Himachal Pradesh State Small Industries and Export Corporation are entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

सं० 11-2/93 (लैब०) आई० डी० भाग-2002/Parwanoo.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Smt. Veena Rana c/o Shri Ramesh Rana, Fozi Dhaba Eicher gate, Sector-2, Parwanoo, District Solan (H. P.) and the Manager, M/s. Prabhu Electronics, Plot No. 11-A, Sector-2, Parwanoo, District Solan (H. P.) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-अम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित अम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination from services of Smt. Veena Rana C/o Shri Ramesh Rana, Fozi Dhaba Eicher Gate, Sector-2, Parwanoo District Solan, H. P. w.e.f. 3-12-2001 without notice and compensation under section 25-F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, by the Manager, M/s Prabhu Electronics, Plot No. 11-A, Sector-2, Parwanoo, Distt. Solan, H. P. is legal and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits including compensation and backwages Smt. Veena Rana is entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-1/85 (लैब) आई० डी० भाग-2002/Kangra.— अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Sunil Kumar s/o Shri Milap Chand, Village Lambher, P.O. Bhawarna, Tehsil Palampur, Distt. Kangra H.P. and the Manager, The Palampur Co-operative Tea Factory, Ltd. Kalu-di-Hatti, P. O. Maranda, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra, (H.P.) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के पश्चात् अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि यह मामला अम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-अम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित अम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किये गये विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Sunil Kumar s/o Shri Milap Chand, Electrician w.e.f. 31-10-2001 by the Manager, the Palampur Co-operative Tea Factory, Kalu-di-Hatti, Palampur without compliance of section 25-F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement with full backwages, the above workman is entitled to?”

शिमला-171 001, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-2/93 (लैब) आई० डी० भाग-2002/Solan.— अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Devinder Singh s/o Shri Nand Lal, Village Dalyar, P.O. Oachghat, District Solan (H. P.) V/s. The Director, M/s Swastik Polysteel Pvt. Ltd., Jatoli, District Solan (H. P.) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के पश्चात् अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला अम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-अम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-7 के अधीन गठित अम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of the services of Shri Devinder Singh, Ex. Machine Operator by the Director M/s Swastik Poly Steel Pvt. Ltd., Jatoli, Distt. Solan, H. P. w. e. f. 21-5-2001 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the aggrieved workman is entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-1/95 (लैब) आई० डी० भाग-रामपुर.— अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्री प्रेम चन्द सुपुत्र श्री नूरत राम, गांव गाहन, उत्त-हमील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश तथा वन मण्डल अधिकारी, रामपुर वृषहर, जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के पश्चात् अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला अम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-अम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित अम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“क्या श्री प्रेम चन्द सुपुत्र श्री नूरत राम, को वन मण्डल अधिकारी, रामपुर द्वारा दिनांक 7-6-1999 को मौखिक रूप से बिना नोटिस व छंटी मुआवजा दिए काम पर से निकालना न्याय संगत है? यदि नहीं, तो कामगार किस क्षतिपूर्ति एवं सेवा लाभों का हकदार है?”

शिमला-1, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-1/85 (लैब) आई० डी० भाग/2002/Kangra.— अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Sh. Jai Chand and 25 others as per list annexed V/s. The Manager, The Palampur Co-operative Tea Factory Ltd. Kalu-Di-Hatti, P. O. Maranda, Tehsil Palampur, District Kangra (H. P.) के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के पश्चात् अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला अम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-अम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले

को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/ औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिये भेजा जाता है :—

“Whether the termination of the services of the workmen S/Shri Jai Chand and 25 others (as per List annexed) with effect from 1-11-2001 by the Manager, The Palampur Co-operative Tea Factory Ltd. Kalu-Di-Ha ti, P.O. Maranda, Tehsil Palampur District Kangra, H.P. without complying the section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is legal and justified? If not, what relief and service benefits, the workmen are entitled to?”

शिमला-1, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-2/93 (लैब 0) आई 0 डी 0 भाग/2002/Solan.—अधो-हस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Hardeva s/o Shri Ram Chander, Code No. 5, Village Juddi, P. O. Baddi, District Solan, H. P. Vs. M/s Birla Textile Mills, Sai Road, Baddi, District Solan, H. P. के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“1. Whether the termination of services of Sh. Hardeva s/o Sh. Ram Chander with effect from 24-2-2001 by M/s Birla Textile Mills, Sai Road Baddi, District Solan, H.P. on completion of more than 240 days of continuous service and without complying the provisions of section 25-N of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits including seniority and backwages, the above workman is entitled to?”

“2. Whether the workman has abandoned the job at his own? If so, its effects?”

शिमला-171 001, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-2/93 (लैब 0) आई 0 डी 0 भाग/2002/सोलन.—अधो-हस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्री सुरेश कुमार मुखर्जी श्री कृष्ण लाल गांव जटोली, डाकबाना ओछाटा, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश तथा निदेशक, मै 0 स्वास्तिक पोली स्टील प्रा 0 लि 0 जटोली, जिला सोलन, हि 0 प्रा 0 के मध्य नीचे दिये गये विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है।

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त

शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किए गए विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“क्या श्री सुरेश कुमार मुखर्जी आपरेटर को निदेशक स्वास्तिक पोली स्टील द्वारा दिनांक 29-5-2001 से नौकरी से निकाला जाना उचित एवं न्यायसंगत है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कामगार किस पूर्व वेतन एवं सेवा लाभों का हकदार?”

शिमला-1, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-2/93 (लैब 0) आई 0 डी 0 भाग-सोलन.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्रीमती हीरा देवी पत्नी श्री मुन्नी लाल, गांव मझगांव, डा 0 शामटी सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश तथा निदेशक, मै 0 स्वास्तिक पोली स्टील प्रा 0 लि 0 जटोली, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किये गए विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“क्या श्रीमती हीरा देवी पत्नी श्री मुन्नी लाल को निदेशक, मै 0 स्वास्तिक पोली स्टील प्रा 0 लि 0 जटोली द्वारा नौकरी से दिनांक 21-5-2001 से निकाला जाना उचित एवं न्यायसंगत है? यदि नहीं तो उक्त कामगार किस पूर्व वेतन एवं लाभों का हकदार है।”

शिमला-171 001, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-2/93 (लैब 0) आई 0 डी 0 भाग/2002/Solan.—अधो-हस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Sh. Ashok Kumar s/o Sh. Harbans Lal through Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, President, H. P. AITUC, Head Quarter Saproon, Distt. Solan H. P. Vs. The Managing Director, M/s Ashoka Spanners Pvt. Ltd., 88-89 Industrial Area Baddi, Distt. Solan (H. P.) के मध्य नीचे दिये गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा 5 के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनिर्णय के लिए भेजने योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक

अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किये गये विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है:—

पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 1993 में और संगोष्ठन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. "Whether the termination of the services of Sh. Ashok Kumar s/o Sh. Harbans Lal w.e.f 18-10-2001, on completion of more than 240 days of continuous service by M/s Ashoka Spanners Pvt. Ltd., 88-89, Industrial Area Baddi, District Solan H.P. and without complying the provision of section 25-N of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief including seniority & back wages above workman is entitled to?"
2. "Whether the workman falls under the designation of Supervisor? If so, its effects?"

शिमला-171 001, 23 सितम्बर, 2002

संख्या 11-1/98 (लैव0) आई0 डी0 माग-Hamirpur.—ग्रधो-हस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि Shri Parkash Chand s/o Shri Sita Ram, Quarter No. 260, Ward No. 8 Naya Nagar Hamirpur, Distt. Hamirpur, H. P. Vs. Sardar Balwant Singh Owner, P. K. Transport Corporation, Head Office, 7-New Kutub Road, Delhi-110006 के मध्य नीचे दिए गए विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 12 (4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रदत्त की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के उपरान्त ग्रधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि मामला ग्रम-न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अधिनियम के लिये भजन योग्य है।

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-अम (लज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए ग्रधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्द्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित ग्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किये गये विषय पर अधिनियम देने के लिए भेजा जाता है:—

"Whether the termination of services of Sh. Parkash Chand s/o Sh. Sita Ram Ex-Branch Manager by Sardar Balwant Singh, Owner P. K. Transport Corporation Hamirpur, H.P. & Head office at 7-New Kutub Road, Delhi-110006 w.e.f. 11-1-2000 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 is proper and justified? If not, what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation the aggrieved workman is entitled to?"

हस्ताक्षरित/-
अमायुक्त।

समाज, महिला एवम् अनुसूचित जाति कल्याण विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 1 अक्टूबर, 2002

संख्या कल्याण-बी(2)-4/79-III.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श से इस विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या डब्ल्यू0 एल0 एक0-बी0(2)-4/79, तारीख 1-10-1993 द्वारा अधिपूजित हिमाचल प्रदेश समाज, महिला एवं अनु0 जाति कल्याण विभाग में "पर्यवेक्षक", वर्ग-III (अराजपत्रित) के

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश, समाज, महिला एवं अनु0 जाति कल्याण विभाग "पर्यवेक्षक", वर्ग-III (अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (प्रथम संगोष्ठन) नियम, 2002 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किये जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. उपावन्ध 'अ' का संगोष्ठन.—हिमाचल प्रदेश समाज, महिला एवं अनु0 जाति कल्याण विभाग "पर्यवेक्षक" (वर्ग-III, अराजपत्रित) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 1993 के उपावन्ध "अ" में:—

(क) स्तम्भ संख्या 6 के सामने विद्यमान उपवन्धों में अंकों और शब्दों "18—40 वर्ष के स्थान पर 18—45" वर्ष अंक और शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे।

(ख) स्तम्भ संख्या 7 (क) के सामने विद्यमान उपवन्धों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे, अर्थात्:—

आंगनवाड़ी कार्यकर्ता जिन्होंने मान्यता प्राप्त स्कूल शिक्षा बोर्ड/संस्थान से दसवीं की परीक्षा पास की हो तथा जिनका इस रूप में 5 वर्ष का सेवाकाल हो,

या

बाल सेवािका जिसने मान्यता प्राप्त स्कूल शिक्षा बोर्ड/संस्थान से दसवीं की परीक्षा पास की हो और जिसने 5 वर्ष के सेवाकाल सहित बाल सेवािका के रूप में 11 मास का प्रशिक्षण प्राप्त किया हो, या बाल सेवािका जिन्होंने मान्यता प्राप्त स्कूल शिक्षा बोर्ड/संस्थान से दसवीं पास की हो तथा जिसने मान्यता प्राप्त औद्योगिक प्रशिक्षण संस्थान से सिलाई एवं कटाई का प्रशिक्षण प्राप्त किया हो, और इसका प्रमाण-पत्र प्राप्त किया हो, तथा इस रूप में 5 वर्ष सेवाकाल हो,

या

मान्यता प्राप्त विश्वविद्यालय से स्नातक की उपाधि प्राप्त की हो।

(ग) स्तम्भ संख्या 10 के सामने विद्यमान उपवन्धों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे, अर्थात्:—

(i) आंगनवाड़ी कार्यकर्ताओं के प्रवर्गों में से जिन्होंने मान्यता प्राप्त स्कूल शिक्षा बोर्ड/संस्थान से दसवीं पास की हो और जिनका इस रूप में 5 वर्ष का सेवाकाल हो, बाल-बाड़ी अध्यापिका/शिल्प अध्यापिका जो दसवीं शिक्षा मान्यता प्राप्त स्कूल बोर्ड/संस्थान से पास हो तथा इस रूप में 5 वर्ष का सेवाकाल हो, बालवाड़ी और जिलन अध्यापिका को मान्यता प्राप्त स्कूल शिक्षा बोर्ड/संस्थान से दसवीं पास हो तथा सिलाई कटाई में मान्यता प्राप्त प्रशिक्षण संस्थान से प्रशिक्षण/प्रमाण-पत्र प्राप्त हो तथा इस रूप में 5 वर्ष का सेवाकाल हो, बाल सेवािका जो मान्यता प्राप्त स्कूल शिक्षा बोर्ड/संस्थान से दसवीं पास हो तथा 11 महीने का बाल सेवािका का प्रशिक्षण प्राप्त हो और इस रूप में 5 वर्ष का सेवाकाल/अनुभव हो, समिति प्रतियोगिता के माध्यम से, अर्थात् हिमाचल प्रदेश समाज महिला एवं अनु0 जाति कल्याण विभाग में कार्यरत अर्थात्तियों को लिखित परीक्षा/साक्षात्कार संचालित करके 90 प्रतिशत सीधी भर्ती द्वारा।

(ii) 10 प्रतिशत उन अभ्यर्थियों को सीधी भर्ती द्वारा जो किसी मान्यता प्राप्त विश्वविद्यालय से स्नातक की अर्हता रखते हों।

आदेश द्वारा,
हस्ताक्षरित/-
सचिव।

[Authoritative English text of this Department notification No. WLF-B(2)-4/79-III, dated 1st October, 2002 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

SOCIAL, WOMEN'S AND SC WELFARE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 1st October, 2002

No. WLF-B(2)-4/79-III.—In exercise of powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, the Governor of Himachal Pradesh in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission is pleased to make the following Rules further to amend the Himachal Pradesh, Social, Women & SC Welfare Department, Supervisor, Class-III, (Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 1993 notified vide this department notification No. WLF-B(2)-4/79 dated 1-10-1993, namely:—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Social, Women & SC Welfare Department, Supervisor, Class-III (Non-Gazetted) (Non Ministerial Services) Recruitment and Promotion (Third Amendment) Rules, 2002.

(2) These rules shall come into force from the date of publication in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. *Amendment of Annexure "A".*—In Annexure "A" to the Himachal Pradesh, Social, Women's Welfare Department, Supervisor (Class-III, Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 1993:—

(a) For the existing provisions against Column No. 6, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"Between 18 years & 45 years".

(b) For the existing provisions against Column No. 7, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

Anganwari Workers who have passed Matriculation examination from a recognised Board of School Education/Institution with 5 year service ;

OR

Balsewika who have passed Matriculation Examination from a recognised Board of School Education/Institution and also received 11 months training as Balsewika with 5 years service; OR Balsewika's who have passed Matriculation Examinations and have undergone Training/obtained certificate from recognised ITI in Cutting & Tailoring with 5 years service;

OR

Should be a Graduate from a recognised University.

(c) for the existing provisions against Col. No. 10, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

(i) 90% by direct recruitment from amongst the categories of Anganwari Workers, who have passed Matriculation Examination from a recognised Board of School Education/Institution with 5 years service, Balwari and Craft Teachers who have passed Matriculation education/Institution with 5 years service, Balwari & Craft Teachers. who have passed Matriculation Examinations and have received training/obtained certificate from recognised ITI in cutting & Tailoring with 5 years Service, Balsewikas who have passed Matriculation Examination from a recognised Board of School Education/Institution and also undergone 11 months training as Balsewika with 5 years service/experience through Limited competition i.e. by conducting examination in written/interview from amongst the candidates working in the Social, Women's and SC Welfare Department of Himachal Pradesh.

(ii) 10% by direct recruitment of candidates who possess Graduation qualification from a recognised University.

By order,

Sd/-
Secretary.

भाग 4—स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन, म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड और टाऊन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग

-शून्य-

भाग 5—वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, भटियात स्थित चुवाड़ी जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश
मिसल नं० तारीख दायरा तारी पेशी
14/3-IX-A/2002 5-1-2002 31-10-02
श्री चैन सिंह पुत्र बेन्ता, निवासी जसूर, परगना टुण्डी, तहसील भटियात ।

बनाम

1. श्री नरेंद्र सिंह, 2. चमन सिंह, 3. राम सिंह, 4. गगन सिंह, 5. मधर सिंह पुत्र, 6. सवित्री देवी, 7. सिमलो देवी, 8. शकुन्तला देवी, 9. उमला देवी, 10. विद्या देवी पुत्रियां व 11. जैवेई विधवा नानक पुत्र जन्त, निवासी भटका, परगना टुण्डी, तहसील भटियात, जिला चम्बा ।

दरख्वास्त तकसीम भूमि जेर धारा 123 हि० प्र० भू-राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954, खाता खतोनी नं० 49/77, कित्ता व रकबा 5-1 बीघा मुहान समोट परगना टुण्डी, तहसील भटियात, जिला चम्बा ।

प्रार्थी ने भूमि खाता खतोनी नं० 49/77 मुहान समोट की तकसीम हेतु प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है । फरीकन दोयम को इस अदालत द्वारा कई बार ममन जारी किए गए परन्तु उस पर साधारण तरीके से तामील न हो पा रही है अतः फरीक दोम नं० 3. राम सिंह, 5. मधर सिंह, 6. सवित्री देवी, 7. सिमलो देवी, 8. शकुन्तला देवी, 10. विद्या देवी को इस

ईशतहार हजा द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 31-10-2002 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजर होकर मुकद्दमा की परबी करें अन्यथा कार्यवाही एक पक्षीय क्रमल में लाई जाएगी ।

आज दिनांक 29-8-2002 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-

सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, भटियात स्थित चुवाड़ी, जिला चम्बा (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, भटियात स्थित चुवाड़ी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिसल नं० तारीख दायरा तारीख पेशी
15/3-IX-A/02 5-1-02 31-10-02

श्री चैन सिंह, पुत्र बेन्ता, निवासी जसूर, परगना टुण्डी, तहसील भटियात ।

बनाम

1. नरेंद्र सिंह, 2. चमन सिंह, 3. राम सिंह, 4. गगन सिंह, 5. मधर सिंह पुत्र, 6. सवित्री देवी, 7. सिमलो देवी, 8. शकुन्तला देवी,

9. उमला देवी, 10. विद्या देवी पुत्रियां व 11. श्रीमति जैदेई विधवा नानक पुत्र जन्त, निवासी भटका, परगना टुण्डी, तहसील भटियात, जिला चम्बा ।

दरखास्त तकसीम भूमि जेर धारा 123 हि0 प्र0 भू-गजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 खाता खतोनी नं0 94/125 किता 2. रक्बा 1-12 विद्या व खाता खतोनी नं0 126/124 किता 1 रक्बा 0-5 बीघा, मुहाल जसूर, परगना टुण्डी, तहसील भटियात, जिला चम्बा ।

प्रार्थी चैन सिंह पुत्र वन्ता, निवासी जसूर ने भूमि खाता खतोनी नं0 94/125 व 126/124 की तकसीम वारा आवेदन किया है । फरीक-दोयम नं0 3 राम सिंह, 5. मधर सिंह, 6. सवित्री, 7. सिमनो, 8. शकुन्तला, 10. विद्या देवी को इस अदालत द्वारा कई बार समन जारी किए गए परन्तु तामील नियमानुसार न हो पा रही है जिससे अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास हो चुका है कि उक्त फरीकन दोयम पर साधारण ढंग से तामील होना असम्भव है ।

अतः उपरोक्त फरीक दोयम को इस इशतहार हजा द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 31-10-2002 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर मुकद्दमा की पैरवी करें । अग्रा पैरवी की सूरत में एकपक्षीय कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी ।

आज दिनांक 29-8-2002 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
भटियात (चुवाड़ी), जिला चम्बा (हि0 प्र0) ।

ब अदालत जनाव पी0 आर0 वर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी
दण्डाधिकारी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)

श्रीमती निशा डोगरा पत्नी श्री सतीश कुमार, वाई नं0 7, नगर
पंचायत सुजानपुर, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)

प्रार्थी पक्ष ।

बनाम

1. सचिव, नगर पंचायत, सुजानपुर, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला
हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ।

2. ग्राम जनता, वासी टीका, सुजानपुर, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला
हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) प्रतिवादी पक्ष ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र अन्तर्गत जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु तिथि
पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता व सचिव नगर पंचायत, सुजानपुर आदि ।

श्रीमती निशा डोगरा पत्नी श्री सतीश डोगरा, वासी टीका, सुजानपुर, वाई नं0 7, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में अपने शपथ-पत्र सहित प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसके लड़के हनी डोगरा व पुत्री ग्रामनी डोगरा का जन्म दिनांक क्रमशः 15-8-1988 व 6-2-1992 को मुकाम सुजानपुर घर पर ही हुआ था लेकिन नगर पंचायत सुजानपुर के अभिलेख में उक्त हनी डोगरा व ग्रामनी डोगरा की जन्म तिथियां पंजीकृत नहीं हैं ।

अतः सचिव नगर पंचायत सुजानपुर को इन्हें पंजीकृत किए जाने के आदेश दिए जायें इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त हनी डोगरा व ग्रामनी डोगरा की जन्म तिथियां पंजीकरण पर कोई एतराज हो तो वह अदालत हजा में दिनांक 6-11-2002 को प्रातः 10 बजे अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर एतराज पेश कर सकता है । अन्यथा मुताबिक शपथ-पत्र जन्म तिथियां पंजीकृत किए जाने बारे आदेश पारित कर दिए जावेंगे ।

आज दिनांक 10-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

पी0 आर0 वर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत जनाव पी0 आर0 वर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी
दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)

श्री भीम सिंह पुत्र श्री रत्न चन्द, वासी टीका, जन्दराल, तहसील
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)

प्रार्थी पक्ष ।

बनाम

1. सचिव, ग्राम पंचायत रंगड़, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर ।

2. ग्राम जनता प्रतिवादी पक्ष ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु तिथि पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता व सचिव, ग्राम पंचायत रंगड़ ।

श्री भीम सैन पुत्र श्री रत्न चन्द, वासी टीका, जन्दराल, तहसील
सुजानपुर ने इस अदालत में शपथ-पत्र सहित प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसकी लड़की नेहा कुमारी का जन्म गांव जन्दराल में घर पर हुआ है, लेकिन ग्राम पंचायत रंगड़ के अभिलेख में उक्त नेहा कुमारी जो कि दिनांक 28-2-97 को पैदा हुई है का जन्म पंजीकृत न हुआ है ।

अतः सचिव ग्राम पंचायत रंगड़ को इसे पंजीकृत करने के आदेश पारित किये जावें । इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता व रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को उक्त नेहा कुमारी पुत्री भीम सिंह की जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत करने में कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 6-11-2002 को प्रातः दस बजे कार्यालय हजा में अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है । अन्यथा मुताबिक शपथ-पत्र जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत करने बारे आदेश पारित कर दिये जावेंगे ।

आज दिनांक 10-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

पी0 आर0 वर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत जनाव पी0 आर0 वर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी
दण्डाधिकारी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)

कुंजम डोगरा पत्नी कपिल डोगरा, वासी टीका, सुजानपुर, जिला
हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)

बनाम

1. सचिव, नगर पंचायत सुजानपुर, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला
हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ।

2. ग्राम जनता, वासी टीका सुजानपुर, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला
हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) प्रतिवादी पक्ष ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र अन्तर्गत जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु तिथि
पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता व सचिव नगर पंचायत, सुजानपुर आदि ।

श्रीमती कुंजम डोगरा पत्नी श्री कपिल डोगरा वासी टीका, सुजानपुर, वाई नं0 9, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ने इस अदालत में अपने शपथ-पत्र सहित प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसके लड़के कुनाल डोगरा की जन्म तिथि 4-9-1997 गांव सुजानपुर में हुआ था तथा मुकाम सुजानपुर में घर पर ही हुआ था लेकिन नगर पंचायत सुजानपुर के अभिलेख में उक्त कुनाल डोगरा की जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत नहीं है ।

अतः सचिव नगर पंचायत सुजानपुर को इसे पंजीकृत किए जाने के आदेश दिये जावें । इस नोटिस के द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को

उपरोक्त कुनाल डोगरा पुत्र कपिल डोगरा वासी सुजानपुर की जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण पर कोई एतराज हो तो वह अदालत हजा में दिनांक 6-11-2002 को प्रातः इस बजे अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर एतराज पेश कर सकते हैं। अन्यथा मुताबिक शपथ-पत्र जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत किए जाने वाले आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया।

मोहर।

पी० आर० वर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत जनाब पी० आर० वर्मा, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री सुभाष चन्द पुत्र छांगा राम, वासी जोल, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राथी पक्ष।

बनाम

1. सचिव ग्राम पंचायत वीड वगेहड़ा, 2. ग्राम जनता प्रतिवादी पक्ष।

प्रार्थना-पत्र अन्तर्गत जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता आदि।

श्री सुभाष चन्द पुत्र छांगा राम, वासी टीका जोल, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में अपने शपथ-पत्र सहित प्रार्थना-पत्र दाखल किया है कि उसके पिता श्री छांगा राम पुत्र टीट्टू राम की मृत्यु दिनांक 6-2-1986 को गांव जोल, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश में अपने घर पर हुई थी। लेकिन ग्राम पंचायत वीड वगेहड़ा के अभिलेख में उक्त मृत्यु की मृत्यु तिथि पंजीकृत नहीं है।

अतः सचिव ग्राम पंचायत वीड वगेहड़ा को इसे पंजीकृत किये जाने के आदेश दिये जावें। इस नोटिस के द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त व्यक्ति की मृत्यु तिथि पंजीकरण पर कोई एतराज हो तो वह इस अदालत में दिनांक 5-11-2002 को अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा मुताबिक शपथ-पत्र मृत्यु पंजीकृत किये जाने वाले आदेश पारित कर दिये जावेंगे।

आज दिनांक 4-9-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

पी० आर० वर्मा,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी, दण्डाधिकारी,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री लाल बोर राय, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील बड़ोह, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री ज्ञान चन्द पुत्र गोपी राम वासी मुहाल भाडी, मौजा लूहना, तहसील बड़ोह, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री ज्ञान चन्द पुत्र गोपी राम, वासी बाडो, मौजा लूहना, तहसील बड़ोह ने प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री पूजा रानी का जन्म 5-11-1992 को हुआ है परन्तु किसी कारणवश पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज न हो सका है।

अतः ग्राम जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण करने वाले किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-10-2002 को सुबह 10 बजे या इससे पहले अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 24-9-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

लाल बोर राय,
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
बड़ोह, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री लाल बोर राय, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बड़ोह, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री जय देव पुत्र जोहली, वासी लाहड़, मौजा सरोजी, तहसील बड़ोह जिला कांगड़ा हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

श्री जयदेव पुत्र जोहली, वासी महाल लाहड़, मौजा सरोजी तहसील बड़ोह, ने प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि कांगजात माल (राजस्व रिकार्ड) में मेरा नाम जयधर लिखा गया है परन्तु प्रचलित नाम जयदेव है। अब राजस्व रिकार्ड में जयधर उपनाम जय देव किया जावे।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति या रिश्तेदारों को राजस्व रिकार्ड में नाम जयधर उपनाम जयदेव करने वाले कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-10-2002 को प्रातः 10 बजे अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-9-2002 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

लाल बोर राय,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
तहसील बड़ोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री वेस राज, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, इन्दौरा, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

निकू राम

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस

बनाम

ग्राम जनता।

श्री निकू राम पुत्र श्री रणिया राम, वासी भोजपुर, डाकखाना बहादुर, तहसील इन्दौरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि०प्र०) ने इस अदालत हजा में शपथ-पत्र सहित मुकद्मा दाखल किया है कि उसकी पुत्री कोमल कुमारी की जन्म तिथि 20 अक्तूबर, 1998 है परन्तु कानून की अज्ञानतावश ग्राम पंचायत बहादुर में उक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत न हुई है। अतः इसे पंजीकृत करने के आदेश दिए जावें।

अतः इस नोटिस (राजपत्र-हिमाचल प्रदेश) द्वारा ग्राम जनता व सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त बन्धु की जन्म तिथि के पंजीकृत करने वाले कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-10-2002 को वरवक्त 10.00 बजे प्रातः अयो-हस्ताक्षरों के समक्ष अदालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर उजर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा मुताबिक शपथ-पत्र जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 7-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। देस राज,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इन्दौरा, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री देस राज, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी
इन्दौरा, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

निककू राम बनाम ग्राम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री निककू राम पुत्र श्री रणिया राम वासी भोजपुर, डाकखाना बहादुर, तहसील इन्दौरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) ने इस अदालत हजा में शपथ-पत्र सहित मुकद्मा दाखल किया है कि उसकी पुत्री दीक्षा कुमारी की जन्म तिथि 11 मार्च, 1997 है परन्तु कानूनी अज्ञानतावश ग्राम पंचायत बहादुर में उक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत न हुई है। अतः इसे पंजीकृत करने के आदेश दिए जावें।

इस नोटिस (राजपत्र-हिमाचल प्रदेश) द्वारा ग्राम जनता व सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त बच्ची के जन्म की तिथि को पंजीकृत करने वाले कोई एतराज हो तो वह वह दिनांक 31-10-2002 को बरख्त 10.00 बजे प्रातः अधोहस्ताक्षरी के समक्ष उपस्थित होकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा सुतत्विक शपथ-पत्र जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 7-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। देस राज,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
इन्दौरा, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री मनोहर लाल, तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता
प्रथम श्रेणी, जवाली, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिसल नं० उतवान मुकद्मा तारीख पेशी
122/02 तकसीम 1-11-02

1. अजीत सिंह, 2. सुरेश कुमार, 3. रमेश कुमार पुत्रान
अमी चन्द, निवासीयान पपाहन, मौजा व तहसील जवाली, जिला
कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

1. पुष्पा देवी विधवा, 2. राजिन्द्र कुमार पुत्र प्रकाश चन्द,
3. ईश्वर दास पुत्र पाली, 4. हरचन्स सिंह, 5. कैलाश चन्द,
6. हरचरण सिंह, 7. हरभजन सिंह, 8. हरजीत सिंह, 9. जीता
सिंह, 10. कुलदीप सिंह पुत्रान सुदामा, 11. उमिला देवी,
12. दर्शना देवी, 13. सुरेन्द्रा देवी, 14. सुमना देवी पुत्रियां,
15. सीता देवी विधवा सुदामा, 16. गीता देवी विधवा भूरु,
17. सोम दत्त पुत्र बुग्गा, 18. कमलेश कुमारी, 19. सुदेश
कुमारी, 20. सुमन कुमारी पुत्रियां, 21. पुष्पा देवी विधवा
प्रकाश चन्द, 22. जसन्त सिंह, 23. बलदेव राज, 24. गिरधारी
लाल, 25. सुभाष चन्द पुत्रान भगत राम, 26. हन्स राज,
27. राज कुमार, 28. देस राज पुत्रान तारा चन्द, 29. राकेश
पाल पुत्र, 30. कुमारी उर्मिला पुत्री, 31. श्रीमती यशोधरा देवी
विधवा लेख राम, निवासीयान पपाहन, तहसील जवाली।

दरखास्त बराये तकसीम आराजी खाता नं० 225, खतीनी
नं० 237, 238, खसरा नं० 106, 108, 113, 115,
कित्ता 5, रक्बा तादादी 0-80-20 हैकटेयर बाक्या महाल पपाहन,
मौजा चलगाड़ा, तहसील जवाली, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

उपरोक्त विषय के सम्बन्ध में फरीकदोयम को कई बार
समन जारी किये गये परन्तु उनकी तामोल आमान तरीके से
नहीं हो रही है और न ही उनके सही पत्र प्राप्त हो रहे हैं।
अतः उपरोक्त फरीकदोयम को इस इशतहार राजपत्र द्वारा सूचित
किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 1-11-2002 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे
असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आवें। गैर हाजरी की
सूरत में एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

यह इशतहार आज दिनांक 21-9-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व
मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर मनोहर लाल,
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
जवाली, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री मनोहर लाल, तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता,
प्रथम श्रेणी, जवाली, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिसल नं० उतवान मुकद्मा तारीख पेशी
123/02 तकसीम 1-11-02

1. अजीत सिंह, 2. सुरेश कुमार, 3. रमेश कुमार पुत्रान
अमी चन्द, निवासीयान पपाहन, मौजा व तहसील जवाली प्राणी।

बनाम

1. पुष्पा देवी विधवा, 2. राजिन्द्र कुमार पुत्र प्रकाश चन्द,
3. गीता देवी विधवा भूरु, 4. सोम दत्त पुत्र बुग्गा, 5. कमलेश
कुमारी, 6. सुदेश कुमारी, 7. सुमन कुमारी, 8. त्रिपता देवी
पुत्रियां, 9. पुष्पा देवी विधवा प्रकाश चन्द, 10. जसन्त सिंह,
11. बलदेव राज, 12. गिरधारी लाल, 13. सुभाष चन्द पुत्रान
भगत राम, 14. हन्स राज, 15. राज कुमार, 16. देस राज
पुत्रान तारा चन्द, 17. राकेश पाल पुत्र, 18. कुमारी उर्मिला
पुत्री, 19. यशोधरा देवी विधवा लेख राज, निवासीयान पपाहन,
डाकवर झौका रतियाल, तहसील जवाली, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल
प्रदेश।

दरखास्त बराये तकसीम आराजी खाता नं० 228, खतीनी
नं० 240, खसरा नं० 127, 128, 129, 135, 134, 139,
140, 141, 142, 143, कित्ता 10, रक्बा तादादी 0-57-53,
हैकटेयर बाक्या महाल पपाहन, मौजा चलगाड़ा, तहसील जवाली,
जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

उपरोक्त विषय के सम्बन्ध में फरीकदोयम को कई बार
समन जारी किये गये परन्तु उनकी तामोल साधारण तरीके से
नहीं हो रही है और न ही उनके सही पत्र प्राप्त हो रहे हैं।

अतः उपरोक्त फरीकदोयम को इस इशतहार राजपत्र द्वारा
सूचित किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 1-11-2002 को प्रातः
10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आवें। गैर-
हाजरी की सूरत में एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही अमल में लाई
जायेगी।

यह इशतहार आज दिनांक 2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर
व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर मनोहर लाल,
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
जवाली, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री जगदीश राम, तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम
श्रेणी, खुण्डिया, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

मुकद्मा तकसीम नं० 20/2002 व 21/2002

तारीख पेशी 7-11-2002

उतवान मुकद्मा तकसीम भूक खाता नं० 1 व 3 बाक्या महाल
डिब्ब, मौजा मझोग, तहसील खुण्डिया, जिला कांगड़ा।

श्री रत्न चन्द पुत्र श्री परमा उपनाम परमानन्द, निवासी महाल डिब्ब, मोजा मझीण, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा .. प्रार्थी ।

बनाम

श्री नानक चन्द पुत्र सूबा भादि वासी महाल डिब्ब, मोजा मझीण, तहसील खुण्डियां .. प्रत्यर्थागण ।

विषय. — इस्तहार मुस्त्री मुनादी बराये तलवी, प्रत्यर्थागण ।

विपन कुमार, राम प्रशाद, श्रीमती प्रमीला देवी पुत्री प्रेम चन्द, श्रीमती तुलसी देवी विधवा जैसी राम, श्रीमती पाली पुत्री रोड़ा, जगदीश चन्द पुत्र नन्दु, प्रकाश चन्द पुत्र लखू, जीत कुमार, चमन लाल पुत्र व श्रीमती बीना देवी पुत्री, जीवना कुमारी पुत्री खिनु, श्रीमती चिन्ता देवी, श्रीमती व्यासा देवी, सुदामा, हुवम चन्द, श्रीमती जमना देवी, राजमल, ओम प्रकाश. स्वामी राम, श्रीमती सिमरा देवी, श्रीमती प्यार देवी, प्रकाश, संसार चन्द, कुमारी स्वर्णा देवी, श्रीमती देवा, विधवा किरण, ओम प्रकाश प्रकाश चन्द, रमेश चन्द, विशम्बर, सुभाष चन्द, कुमारी काश्मीरा देवी, स्वर्णा देवी, मुन्शी, हरिया पुत्र चहुडू, निवासी महाल डिब्ब, मोजा मझीण, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) ।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा तकसीम में उक्त प्रत्यर्थियों की तामील बार-बार करने पर नहीं हो पा रही है । अतः अदालत हजा को विश्वास हो चुका है कि इनकी तामील साधारण तरीके से नहीं हो सकती है । अतः उक्त प्रत्यर्थियों को इस इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि आप स्वयं या किसी वकील द्वारा तारीख पेशी दिनांक 7-11-2002 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत होंगे । अन्यथा आप के विरुद्ध एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जा कर अग्रामी आदेश पारित कर दिया जाएगा ।

यह इस्तहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 17-9-2002 को जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

जगदीश राम,
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा,
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी, नूरपुर, तहसील नूरपुर,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

किस्म मुकद्दमा : दस्तूरी

तारीख पेशी : 6-11-2002

उत्तम सिंह पुत्र श्री ज्ञान सिंह, निवासी महाल कण्डवाल, तहसील नूरपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) .. प्रार्थी ।

बनाम

जगदीश सिंह पुत्र धन्नु व अन्य निवासीगण महाल वरण्डा, मोजा वरण्डा कण्डवाल, तहसील नूरपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)
प्रतिवादीगण ।

प्रार्थना-पत्र दस्तूरी खाना काशत बावत भूमि खाता नं० 280 मिन खतीना नं० 612 किता 3 रकबा तादादी 0-57-49 है० मा० वाक्या महाल कण्डवाल, मोजा वरण्डा कण्डवाल. तहसील नूरपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) ।

रोटिस बनाम :

श्री रजिन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री धन्नु, निवासी महाल वरण्डा, मोजा वरण्डा कण्डवाल, तहसील नूरपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) ।

उपरोक्त दावा दस्तूरी इम न्यायालय के विचाराधीन है जिसमें प्रतिवादी रजिन्द्र सिंह पुत्र धन्नु, निवासी महाल वरण्डा, तहसील नूरपुर की हाजरी जरूरी है । उपरोक्त प्रतिवादी को न्यायालय से समन जारी किए गए परन्तु नामील समन नियमानुसार न ही गयी है प्रतिवादी उक्त का स्थायी पना आसानी से उपलब्ध न हो रहा है उसकी तामील साधारण ढंग से सम्भव न है । अतः उक्त प्रतिवादी को बजरिया इस्तहार

राजपत्र सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 6-11-2002 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन अथवा वकालतन उपस्थित होकर मुकद्दमा की पैरवी कर सकता है । निश्चित तिथि पर उपस्थित न होने की सूत्र में उसके खिलाफ एक तरफा कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जावेगी ।

आज दिनांक 10-10-2002 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
नूरपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत उपमण्डलाधिकारी (ना०) निचार स्थित भावानगर
जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०)

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री केसरू राम पुत्र श्री धन दास, ग्राम निचार, तहसील निचार,
जिला किन्नौर (हि० प्र०) ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा अनुसार उनवान वाला में प्रार्थी श्री केसरू राम पुत्र धन दास ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश की है कि उसकी अपनी जन्म तिथि 7-3-1943 को हुई है लेकिन उसकी जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में गलत पंजीकृत हुई है ।

अतः ग्राम जनता को बजरिया राजपत्र सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के द्वारा किसी को भी उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 6-11-2002 की असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में प्रातः 10.00 बजे हाजिर आवें तथा अपने उजर पेश करें अथवा उपरोक्त आवेदक की जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में तबदील करने बारे आदेश जारी किया जाएगा ।

आज दिनांक 5-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०),
निचार स्थित भावानगर, जिला किन्नौर, (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना०), निचार स्थित भावानगर,
जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा :

श्रीमती देवा मनी पत्नी श्री केसरू राम, ग्राम साकिन निचार, तहसील निचार, जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा अनुसार उनवान वाला में प्रार्थीया श्रीमती देवामनी पत्नी श्री केसरू राम ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश की है कि उसका अपना नाम देवामनी है लेकिन उसका नाम तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में गलत दर्ज हुआ है ।

अतः ग्राम जनता को बजरिया राजपत्र सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के द्वारा किसी को भी कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 6-11-2002 को असालतन व वकालतन इस अदालत में प्रातः 10.00 बजे हाजिर आवें

तथा अपने उजर पेश करें अन्यथा उपरोक्त आवेदक का नाम पंचायत अभिलेख में तबदील करने बारे आदेश जारी किया जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 5-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डलाधिकारी (ना 0),
निचार, स्थित भावानगर, जिला किनौर (हि 0 प्र 0)।

ब अदालत श्री राजीव सूद, उप न्यायाधीश प्रथम श्रेणी, मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि 0 प्र 0)

दावा नं 0:62/2002
प्रकृति : दस्तौ नाम

श्री राजीव ठाकुर पुत्र मृतक श्री रघुवीरसिंह पुत्र श्री रोहलू राम, निवासी जेंडी, फाटो वारी, कोठी बड़ागढ़, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि 0 प्र 0)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उन्नावतवाला में प्रार्थी ने इस न्यायालय में वज्रिया वकील अपने नाम की दस्तौ हेतु प्रकरण दायर किया है। प्रार्थी/दावा के अनुसार सही नाम राजीव ठाकुर है तथा पंचायत अभिलेख व स्कूल प्रमाण-पत्र में यह राजीव ठाकुर के नाम दर्ज है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख में भोप राम के नाम से दर्ज है। अतः प्रार्थी राजस्व अभिलेख में भी भोप राम के स्थान पर राजीव ठाकुर के नाम को प्रविष्टि करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इशतहार के माध्यम से समस्त जनता, सम्बन्धित क्षेत्र व हितवद्ध कोई भी व्यक्ति अथवा संस्था जिसे उपरोक्त नाम की दस्तौ बारे कोई आपत्ति अथवा अनुरोध हो तो वह दिनांक 31-10-2002 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे सुबह इस अदालत में व्यक्तिगत रूप से अथवा किसी अधिवक्ता के माध्यम से अपनी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा कोई भी आपत्ति प्रस्तुत न होने पर एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 28-9-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
राजीव सूद,
उप-न्यायाधीश प्रथम श्रेणी,
मनाली, तहसील मनाली, जिला कुल्लू (हि 0 प्र 0)।

ब अदालत जनाब जी 0 आर 0 बन्सल, नाथ तहसीलदार, उप-तहसील बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी (हि 0 प्र 0)

दावा दस्तौ नाम।

ब मुकद्दमा :

श्री तवेराम पुत्र श्री गुमत राम, निवासी गांव सुधराणी, ई 0 नारायणगढ़, उप-तहसील बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी (हि 0 प्र 0)।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र बावत दस्तौ नाम कागजात माल तारा, चन्द, उप-नाम तवेराम के स्थान पर तवेराम दर्ज करने बारा।

श्री तवेराम उप-नाम तारा चन्द, निवासी गांव सुधराणी, ई 0 नारायणगढ़, उप-तहसील बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त पेश की है कि उसका नाम स्कूल रिकार्ड में तवेराम है तथा पंचायत/राजस्व रिकार्ड में तारा चन्द उपनाम तवेराम रिकार्ड है। इस इशतहार के माध्यम से प्रार्थी अपना नाम मात्र तवेराम ही रखना चाहता है। अतः ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि इस इशतहार के प्रकाशित होने के एक मास के भीतर अगर किसी को नाम दस्तौ बारा एतराज हो तो

वह एतराज दर्ज कर सकता है अन्यथा प्रार्थी का नाम दर्ज कर दिया जाएगा।

मोहर।
जी 0 आर 0 बन्सल,
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील बाली चौकी, जिला मण्डी (हि 0 प्र 0)।
ब अदालत श्री मोनू राम धोमान, महायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, करसोग, जिला मण्डी (हि 0 प्र 0)

मिसल नं 0: 27/02 तारीख पेशी : 6-11-2002.

मुकद्दमा तकसीम :

श्री नील कण्ठ पुत्र श्री कुन्दन, निवासी मुहान गजेहा, ई 0 कन्जौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी (हि 0 प्र 0) वादीगण।

बनाम

1. श्री हिरा सिंह पुत्र, 2. रोजनी देवी, 3. श्यामी देवी पुत्रियां मानधर,
4. श्रीमती जिवणी देवी विधवा मानधर, निवासी धनीबारा, ई 0 कन्जौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, 5. श्रीमती वरागत् विधवा बालक राम, निवासी नोशा, ई 0 कन्जौण, 6. श्री कौन राम, 7. श्री यन दास पुत्राण दमोदर, निवासी थनाली ई 0 कन्जौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी।
8. श्री देवी सिंह पुत्र लुदर मणी, निवासी काण्डा, ईलाका लोयर करसोग, तहसील करसोग, 9. गुमति पुर्वा लुदर मणी, निवासी लोल, ईलाका कन्जौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, 10. कौशल्या विधवा भीम सिंह, 11. गुड्डी देवी पत्नी जगरनाथ, 12. लाभ सिंह, 13. ऊमर सिंह पुत्राण जगरनाथ, 14. भागीरथी पुत्री पवन कुमार, 15. यशवन्त कुमार पुत्र पवन कुमार, 16. श्रीमती परम दासी विधवा पवन कुमार, निवासी काण्डा, ई 0 लोअर करसोग, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, 17. श्री कर्ग चन्द पुत्र बालक, निवासी नोशा, ई 0 कन्जौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, 18. कुमारी राधू पुत्री पम्पलू, नि 0 चौरा, ई 0 माह, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, 19. देवकी, 20. कौली पुत्र श्याह, निवासी ठांगर, ई 0 रिउमी, तहसील करसोग, 21. श्री लुहार पुत्र परस, निवासी नोशा, ई 0 कन्जौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, 22. श्रीमती पुन्नी विधवा श्याह, निवासी नोशा, ई 0 कन्जौण तहसील करसोग प्रतिवादीगण।

प्रार्थना-पत्र तकसीम जेर धारा 123 बू-राजस्व अधिनियम।

प्रार्थना-पत्र बराये तकसीम भूमि मुहान गजेहा, खाता खनौनी नं 0 78/113 ता 118, कित्ता 21 साबका 14/7, रकबा तादादी 27-17-1 बीघा में 13/24 भाग रकबा बन्दर 15-1-14 बीघा मुहान गजेहा/436, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा में प्रतिवादीगण नं 0 9 ता 21 को इस अदालत द्वारा बार-बार समन जारी करने के बाद तामील न हो पा रही है। अतः अदालत को विश्वास हो गया है कि उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को समन की तामील साधारण ढंग से नहीं हो सकती है।

अतः उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह मिति 6-11-2002 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में वकानतन या असालतन हाजिर आवें। गैर हाजिर की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी तथा मुकद्दमा में आगामी कार्यवाही निश्चयानुसार कर दी जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 18-9-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।
मीनू राम धोमान,
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
करसोग, जिला मण्डी (हि 0 प्र 0)।

In the Court of Shri P. S. Samyal, Sub Judge 1st Class, Theog, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

In re:—

Shri Lagnu Ram s/o of Shri Dheerju, r/o Village Dodra, Tehsil Theog, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh
.. Petitioner.

Versus

General Public

.. Respondent.

Petition u/s 372 of the Indian Succession Act for the grant of Succession Certificate.

Whereas in the above noted case, the petitioner has filed an application in this court under section 372 of the Indian Succession Act, in respect of the assets of Shrimati Dawarku Devi d/o Shri Dheerju, r/o Village Dodra, Tehsil Theog, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh who died on 8-5-2001.

Hence, this proclamation is hereby issued to the General Public of the Illaqua, kith and kins of the deceased to file objections if any, on or before 1-11-2002 at 10.00 A.M. in this court personally or through an authorised agent/counsel, failing which Succession petition will be heard and disposed of *ex parte*.

Given under my hand and seal of this Court this 17th day of September, 2002.

Seal.

P. S. SAMYAL,
Sub-Judge 1st Class,
Theog District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh.

ब अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा, हि० प्र० से०, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब मुकद्दमा :

श्री सरवण सिंह पुत्र श्री मोहन सिंह, निवासी मुहाल रानीताल, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री सरवण सिंह पुत्र श्री मोहन सिंह, निवासी मुहाल रानीताल, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 24-8-1980 नगर परिषद् नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसका वह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

इस बारे प्रार्थी के आवेदन-पत्र पर कार्यकारी अधिकारी, नगर परिषद् नाहन से रिपोर्ट ली गई है जिसने प्रार्थी की पुत्री का नाम कथित ग्राम पंचायत में दर्ज नहीं है की पुष्टि की है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता ग्राम मुहाल रानीताल, नाहन व प्रार्थी श्री सरवण सिंह पुत्र श्री मोहन सिंह, निवासी रानीताल, नाहन के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी नुमायी अमनदीप कोर पुत्री श्री सरवण सिंह की जन्म तिथि 24-8-1980 को नगर परिषद् नाहन में पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 तक अदालत हजा स्थित नाहन में असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर होकर दर्ज करवा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री सरवण सिंह पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

राकेश शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा, हि० प्र० से०, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब मुकद्दमा :

श्रीमती कौशल्या देवी पुत्री श्री राम स्वरूप पत्नी स्वर्गीय श्री हेमन्त, निवासी ग्राम रजोली, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता

श्रीमती कौशल्या देवी पुत्री श्री राम स्वरूप पत्नी स्वर्गीय श्री हेम दत्त, निवासी ग्राम रजोली, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 9-5-1957 ग्राम पंचायत नेहली धोड़ा में दर्ज नहीं है जिसको वह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

इस बारे प्रार्थी के आवेदन-पत्र पर ग्राम पंचायत एवं विकास अधिकारी, ग्राम पंचायत नेहली धोड़ा से रिपोर्ट ली गई जिसने प्रार्थी का नाम कथित ग्राम पंचायत में दर्ज नहीं है की पुष्टि की है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता ग्राम रजोली व प्रार्थी श्रीमती कौशल्या देवी पुत्री श्री रामस्वरूप पति श्री हेम दत्त के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी श्रीमती कौशल्या देवी की जन्म तिथि को ग्राम पंचायत नेहली धोड़ा में पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 तक अदालत हजा स्थित नाहन में असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर होकर दर्ज करवा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्रीमती कौशल्या देवी पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

राकेश शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा, हि० प्र० से०, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)

ब मुकद्दमा :

श्री बचन सिंह पुत्र श्री केसर सिंह, निवासी पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० कलोनो नाहन, जिला सिरमौर हि० प्र०।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री बचन सिंह पुत्र श्री केसर सिंह, निवासी पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० कलोनो नाहन ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 10-2-1986 नगर परिषद् नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है जिसको वह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

इस बारे प्रार्थी के आवेदन-पत्र पर कार्यकारी अधिकारी नगर परिषद् नाहन से रिपोर्ट ली गई जिसने प्रार्थी के पुत्र की जन्म तिथि नगर परिषद् नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है की पुष्टि की है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता, नाहन व प्रार्थी श्री बचन सिंह पुत्र केसर सिंह, निवासी नाहन के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी श्री श्री राज नारायण सिंह पुत्र श्री बचन सिंह की जन्म तिथि 10-2-1986 नगर परिषद् नाहन में पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 तक अदालत हजा स्थित नाहन में असालतन या बकालतन हाजिर होकर दर्ज करवा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री बचन सिंह पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

राकेश शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा, हि० प्र० से०, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)

व मुकद्दमा :

श्रीमती मोना कुमारी पुत्री श्री उद्यम सिंह, निवासी मोहल्ला गोविन्द-गढ़, नाहन, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०) ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

श्रीमती मोना कुमारी पुत्री श्री उद्यम सिंह, निवासी मोहल्ला गोविन्दगढ़, नाहन, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 7-5-1972 है जो नगर पालिका नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसको वह दर्ज करवाना चाहती है ।

इस बारे प्रार्थी के आवेदन-पत्र पर कार्यकारी अधिकारी नगरपालिका परिषद् नाहन से रिपोर्टें ली गई जिसमें प्रार्थी की जन्म तिथि नगरपालिका परिषद् नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है की पुष्टि की है ।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता मोहल्ला गोविन्दगढ़, नाहन व प्रार्थी श्रीमती मोना कुमारी उपरोक्त के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी श्रीमती मोना कुमारी की जन्म तिथि के नगर पालिका नाहन में पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 तक अदालत हजा स्थित नाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर दर्ज करवा सकता है । निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्रीमती मोना कुमारी पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी ।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

राकेश शर्मा,

उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०) ।

व अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा, हि० प्र० से०, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री देवेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र श्री प्रीतम चन्द, निवासी गुन्नुघाट, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०) ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

श्री देवेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र श्री प्रीतम चन्द, निवासी गुन्नुघाट, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हि० प्र० ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 1-9-2000 नगर परिषद् नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है, जिसको वह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है ।

इस बारे प्रार्थी के आवेदन-पत्र पर कार्यकारी अधिकारी नगर परिषद् से रिपोर्टें ली गई जिसने प्रार्थी के पुत्र की जन्म तिथि नगर परिषद् नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है की पुष्टि की है ।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता नाहन व प्रार्थी श्री देवेन्द्र कुमार पुत्र श्री प्रीतम चन्द, निवासी नाहन के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी को भी श्री वातगल अग्रवाल पुत्र श्री देवेन्द्र कुमार की जन्म तिथि 1-9-2000 नगर परिषद् नाहन में पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 तक अदालत हजा स्थित नाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर

दर्ज करवा सकता है । निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री देवेन्द्र कुमार पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी ।

यह इशतहार आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

राकेश शर्मा,

उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०) ।

व अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा (हि० प्र० से०), उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री गोविन्द लाल पुत्र श्री बरोपत, निवासी ग्राम व डा० सम्भूवाला, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

श्री गोविन्द लाल पुत्र श्री बरोपत, निवासी ग्राम व डा० सम्भूवाला, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी माता का नाम भागी देवी है व पिता का नाम बरोपत है परन्तु ग्राम पंचायत बनकला के रिकार्ड में उनकी माता का नाम शिवा देवी तथा पिता का नाम धोधी राम गलत दर्ज किया गया है जिसकी वह दख्ती करवाना चाहता है ।

प्रार्थी श्री गोविन्द लाल के आवेदन-पत्र पर ग्राम पंचायत एवं विकास अधिकारी बनकला से रिपोर्टें ली गई हैं जिन्होंने भी श्री गोविन्द लाल की माता का नाम शिवा देवी तथा पिता का नाम श्री धोधी राम होने की पुष्टि की है ।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता, ग्राम सम्भूवाला व प्रार्थी श्री गोविन्द लाल के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी श्री गोविन्द लाल के माता-पिता के नामों की दख्ती बारे कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे तक अदालत हजा स्थित नाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आ कर दर्ज करा सकता है । निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री गोविन्द लाल पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी ।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया ।

मोहर ।

राकेश शर्मा,

उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा (हि० प्र० से०), उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री सुन्दर सिंह चौहान पुत्र श्री मेहर सिंह, निवासी सुन्दर बाग कलौरी नाहन, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता ।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह चौहान पुत्र श्री मेहर सिंह, निवासी सुन्दर बाग कलौरी, नाहन, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस

अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पौत्र को जन्म तिथि 23-4-2001 नगरपालिका नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है जिसको वह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है तथा जिसका नाम दिविज चौहान है।

इस बारे प्रार्थी के आवेदन-पत्र पर कार्यकारी अधिकारी नगरपालिका, नाहन से रिपोर्ट ली गई जिसने प्रार्थी के पौत्र की जन्म तिथि नगरपालिका नाहन में दर्ज नहीं है की पुष्टि की है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता सुन्दरबाग कलोनी, नाहन व प्रार्थी श्री सुन्दर सिंह चौहान के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी श्री दिविज चौहान की जन्म तिथि के नगरपालिका नाहन में पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 तक अदालत हजा स्थित नाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर दर्ज करवा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना पत्र श्री सुन्दर सिंह चौहान पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। राकेश शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा (हि० प्र० से०), उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री कली राम पुत्र श्री मोती राम, निवासी ग्राम चौरात, उप-तहसील नोहरा, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री कली राम पुत्र श्री मोती राम, निवासी ग्राम चौरात, उप-तहसील नोहरा धार, जिला सिरमौर ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पुत्री कुमारी गायत्री की जन्म तिथि 20-4-1989 है परन्तु ग्राम पंचायत देवना के रिकार्ड में 20-4-1986 गलत दर्ज है जिसको वह दस्त करवाना चाहता है।

इस बारे प्रार्थी श्री कली राम ने अपना एक ध्यानहल्फी भी इस कार्यालय में प्रस्तुत किया है

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता ग्राम चौरात व प्रार्थी श्री कली राम पुत्र श्री मोती राम के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी श्री कली राम की पुत्री कुमारी गायत्री देवी की जन्म तिथि दहस्ती बारे कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 प्रातः 10.00 बजे तक अदालत हजा स्थित नाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की स्थिति में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री कली राम पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। राकेश शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा, हि० प्र० से०, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री चेतन स्वरूप पुत्र श्री हिमा नन्द, निवासी ग्राम क्यारटू, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री चेतन स्वरूप पुत्र श्री हिमा नन्द, निवासी ग्राम क्यारटू, डाकघर जमटा, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी दादी श्रीमती प्रेम देवी का देहान्त दिनांक 8-3-1991 को हुआ था जोकि ग्राम पंचायत नेहली घोड़ा में दर्ज नहीं है जिसको वह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

इस बारे प्रार्थी के आवेदन-पत्र पर ग्राम पंचायत एवं विकास अधिकारी, ग्राम पंचायत नेहली घोड़ा से रिपोर्ट ली गई जिसमें प्रार्थी की दादी की मृत्यु तिथि कथित ग्राम पंचायत में दर्ज नहीं है की पुष्टि की है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता ग्राम क्यारटू व प्रार्थी श्री चेतन स्वरूप पुत्र श्री हिमा नन्द, निवासी क्यारटू के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी श्रीमती प्रेम देवी जो प्रार्थी की दादी है के ग्राम पंचायत नेहली घोड़ा में मृत्यु तिथि के पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 तक अदालत हजा स्थित नाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर दर्ज करवा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री चेतन स्वरूप पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

राकेश शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा, हि० प्र० से०, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा :

श्री राकेश कुमार पुत्र श्री माम चन्द, निवासी ग्राम ददाहू, उप-तहसील ददाहू, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री राकेश कुमार पुत्र श्री माम चन्द, निवासी ददाहू, उप-तहसील ददाहू, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०) ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पुत्र श्री निशान्त गोयल की जन्म तिथि 31-1-1994 ग्राम पंचायत ददाहू में दर्ज नहीं है जिसको वह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

इस बारे प्रार्थी के आवेदन-पत्र पर ग्राम पंचायत एवं विकास अधिकारी, ग्राम पंचायत ददाहू से रिपोर्ट ली गई जिसने प्रार्थी के पुत्र की जन्म तिथि व नाम कथित ग्राम पंचायत में दर्ज नहीं है की पुष्टि की है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त ग्राम जनता ग्राम ददाहू व प्रार्थी श्री राकेश कुमार पुत्र श्री माम चन्द, निवासी ददाहू के समस्त

रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी निशान्त गोयल के नाम को ग्राम पंचायत ददाह में पंजीकरण वारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 तक अदालत हुआ स्थित नाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर दर्ज करवा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री राकेश कुमार पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

राकेश शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री राकेश शर्मा, हि० प्र० से०, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब मुकद्दमा :

श्री मामराज पुत्र राम सिंह, निवासी ग्राम माईना, तहसील संगडाह, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री मामराज पुत्र श्री राम सिंह, निवासी ग्राम माईना, तहसील संगडाह, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 22-3-1997 ग्राम पंचायत माईना घडैल में दर्ज नहीं है जिसको वह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

इस वारे प्रार्थी के आवेदन-पत्र पर ग्राम पंचायत एवं विकास अधिकारी, ग्राम पंचायत माईना घडैल से रिपोर्ट ली गई जिसने प्रार्थी की पुत्री की जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत में दर्ज नहीं है की पुष्टि की है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता ग्राम माईना व श्री मामराज पुत्र श्री राम सिंह, निवासी माईना के समस्त रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी कु० नीशा शर्मा पुत्री श्री मामराज की जन्म तिथि 22-3-1997 को ग्राम पंचायत माईना घडैल में पंजीकरण वारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 3-11-2002 तक अदालत हुआ स्थित नाहन में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर दर्ज करवा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि तक कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री मामराज पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 4-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

राकेश शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री टी० जी० नेगी, उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, अर्की, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती रिता देवी पत्नी श्री होशियार सिंह, निवासी गांव मान, डाकघर मान, तहसील अर्की, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

प्रार्थी उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि उसकी पुत्री ज्योती पाल पुत्री होशियार सिंह का जन्म दिनांक 7-10-2001 को हुआ

है लेकिन ग्राम पंचायत के अभिलेख में उसका नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज न है, अब दर्ज किए जाने के आदेश जारी किए जाने हैं।

अतः इस इशतहार राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस वारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-10-2002 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अमालतन या वकालतन उपस्थित आकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है, वरिष्ठ गुजरनेमियाद कोई भी उजर या एतराज समायत न होगा तथा उमरोक्त की जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 5-10-2002 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व माहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

टी० जी० नेगी,
उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट
अर्की, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

न्यायालय श्री के० एस० चौधरी, सहायक मसाहर्ता प्रथम वर्ग एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)

श्रीमती रोशनी देवी पत्नी श्री प्यारू पुत्र शिवू, गांव मंजड़, तप्पा टिहरा, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०) प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

विषय.—नाम दहस्तो वारे प्रार्थना-पत्र।

श्रीमती रोशनी देवी पत्नी प्यारू पुत्र शिवू, जात हरिजन, गांव मंजड़ ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसकी पत्नी का नाम समस्त अभिलेख में रोशनी देवी है जबकि राजस्व अभिलेख में उसका नाम रतनी देवी दर्ज है। अतः आवेदन-पत्र में अब रतनी देवी को बजाये रोशनी देवी दर्ज करने हेतु निवेदन किया है।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण व ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उपरोक्त नाम रतनी देवी के बजाए रोशनी देवी दर्ज राजस्व अभिलेख करने पर किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 7-11-2002 को असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में उपस्थित होकर पेश करें अन्यथा अनुपस्थिति की सूरत में कार्यवाही एक तरफा अमल में लाई जाएगी और रतनी देवी की बजाए रोशनी देवी दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

मोहर।

के० एस० चौधरी,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
बंगाणा, जिला ऊना,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब अदालत श्री अवनीश शर्मा, नायक तहसीलदार एवं सहायक मसाहर्ता द्वितीय वर्ग, भरवाई, उप-तहसील भरवाई, जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०)

श्री रमेश चन्द सुपुत्र श्री नत्थु, निवासी मलौन, उप-तहसील भरवाई, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—दरखास्त बराये दहस्तो नाम।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा में श्री रमेश चन्द पुत्र नत्थु राम ने इस कार्यालय में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका नाम

रैवेन्यू रिकार्ड में मेहर चन्द दर्ज चला आ रहा है, जिसकी दहस्ती की जावे। उक्त नाम दहस्ती बारे प्रार्थी ने इस न्यायालय में शपथ-पत्र भी प्रस्तुत किया है। प्रार्थी द्वारा प्रस्तुत अन्य दस्तावेज में उसका नाम रमेश चन्द दर्ज है।

अतः इस इशतहार के माध्यम से ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि अगर किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह इस इशतहार के प्रकाशन के उपरान्त एक माह के भीतर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। बाद नुजरने अवधि कोई उजर न नुना जाएगा तथा प्रार्थी का नाम राजस्व रिकार्ड में दहस्ती हेतु आदेश जारी कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 7-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवं कार्यालय/न्यायालय मोहर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

अवनीश शर्मा,
नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता
द्वितीय वर्ग, भरवाई, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

In the Court of Shri Rajeev Bhardwaj, Sub-Judge 1st Class, Court No. 1, Una, Tehsil and District Una (H. P.)

Civil Suit No. 319/95 RBT No. : 275/98

Next date of hearing: 31-10-2000.

Shakuntla Devi & others Vs. Ramesh Chand and others
Suit for Declaration.

Notice to :-

5. Satya Devi wd/o Karam Chand, 6. Surinder Paul, 7. Mahinder Paul, 9. Hari Krishan sons of Karam Chand, r/o Village Malahat, Tehsil and District Una, Himachal Pradesh, 11. Shaminder Rani, 12. Sheela Devi, 13. Raj Rani, 14. Rama Rani daughters of Karam Chand son of Sudhama, all r/o Village Malahat, Tehsil and District Una (H. P.) ... Defendants.

(i) Smt. Santosh Kumari wd/o Pawan Kumar, (ii) Dimple, (iii) Seema daughters of Pawan Kumar, r/o village Gondpur Jai Chand, Tehsil & District Una (H. P.) ... LRs of Defendant No. 8.

Whereas in the above noted case it has been proved to the satisfaction of the court that above named defendants and LRs of defendant No. 8 are avoiding service of summons and cannot be served in the ordinary way. Hence this proclamation is hereby issued against them to appear in this court on or before 31-10-2002 at 10.00 A.M. to defend the case personally or through an authorised agent or pleader failing which *ex parte* proceedings will be taken against them.

Given under my hand and seal of the Court on this 20th day of September, 2002.

Seal.

RAJEEV BHARDWAJ,
Sub-Judge 1st Class,
Court No. 1, Una, District Una (H. P.).

व अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

विजेन्द्र सिंह

बनाम

ग्राम जनता, बसाल

आवेदन-पत्र अर्धीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु रजिस्ट्रेशन अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री विजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री पूर्ण लाल, निवासी गांव बसाल, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त मुजारी है कि उसकी पुत्री नेहा (Neha) का जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज किया जाएगा। उसको उपरोक्त पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 9-9-1997 है तथा जन्म स्थान गांव बसाल है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त ग्राम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है, अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर वांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के आदेश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 3-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवम् कार्यालय/न्यायालय मोहर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

रीटा देवी

बनाम

ग्राम जनता सलोह।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्रीमती रीटा देवी पत्नी श्री सतीश कुमार, निवासी गांव सलोह, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त मुजारी है कि उसके पुत्र राघव जसवाल का नाम व जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाए। उसके पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 13-3-1998 है तथा जन्म स्थान सलोह है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त ग्राम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर वांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निर्देश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 12-9-2002 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

अशोक कुमार

बनाम

ग्राम जनता पनोह।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता ।

श्री अशोक कुमार पुत्र श्री अमरी चन्द, निवासी गांव पनोह, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पुत्री रजनी देवी का नाम व जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाये । उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 31-3-1997 है तथा जन्म स्थान पनोह है ।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर बांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निर्देश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिए जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 11-9-2002 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर । हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि० प्र०) ।

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र ।

रोटा देवी बनाम आम जनता सलोह ।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम; 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता ।

श्रीमती रीटा देवी पत्नी श्री सतीश कुमार, निवासी गांव सनोह, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पुत्र सुनील जसवाल का नाम व जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाए । उसके पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 1-7-1996 है तथा जन्म स्थान सनोह है ।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी का उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर बांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निर्देश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिए जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 12-9-2002 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर । हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र ।

यशपाल बनाम आम जनता पन्जावर ।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता ।

श्री यशपाल पुत्र श्री बहावर सिंह, निवासी गांव पन्जावर, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी

पुत्री मिय स्वीदी का नाम व जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाए । उसके उपरोक्त पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 18-2-1998 है तथा जन्म स्थान पन्जावर है ।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर/एतराज है तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर बांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निर्देश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिए जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 3-10-2002 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर । हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र ।

विजेन्द्र सिंह बनाम आम जनता बसाल ।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता ।

श्री विजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री पूर्ण लाल, निवासी गांव बसाल, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पुत्र नितन का नाम जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज ना करवाया जा सका है, अब दर्ज करवाया जाए । उसके उपरोक्त पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 11-2-99 है तथा जन्म स्थान बसाल है ।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर/एतराज है तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जा कर बांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निर्देश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिए जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 3-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ ।

मोहर । हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र ।

होशयार सिंह बनाम नारी (बाबा डेरा रुद्रू) ।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता ।

श्री होशयार सिंह पुत्र श्री गदावर सिंह, निवासी गांव कूठार कला, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसके पुत्र रवि कुमार का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाए । उस के उपरोक्त पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 17-7-1998 है तथा जन्म स्थान नारी डेरा बाबा रुद्रू है ।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर/एतराज है तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या बकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जा कर बांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निर्देश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिए जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 3-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवम् न्यायालय मोहर से जारी हुआ।
मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना
जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण पत्र।

विजेन्द्र सिंह बनाम आम जनता वसाल
दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

श्री विजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र पूर्ण लाल, निवासी गांव वसाल, तहसील व जिला ऊना से इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पुत्री हिमानी का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाए। उसकी उपरोक्त पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 27-11-1995 है तथा जन्म स्थान वसाल है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर/एतराज है तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर वांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निर्देश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 3-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, जिला ऊना
हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

कमल कृष्ण बनाम आम जनता नगनोली।
दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

श्री कमल कृष्ण पुत्र श्री हरि ओम, निवासी गांव नगनोली, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पुत्री रीतू शर्मा का नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाए। उसकी उपरोक्त पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 14-3-1992 है तथा जन्म स्थान नगनोली है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर/एतराज है तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर वांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निर्देश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 3-10-2002 को हस्ताक्षर मेरे व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, जिला ऊना
हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

ममता बनाम आम जनता मुहल्ला लोहार घुमार, ऊना

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम आम जनता।

श्रीमती ममता पत्नी काकू राम, निवासी गांव छेत्रां, सब-तहसील हरोली, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त गुजारी है कि उसकी पुत्री कुमारी विशाखा का नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाए। उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 25-9-1997 है तथा जन्म स्थान मुहल्ला लोहार घुमार ऊना है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि दर्ज होने में कोई उजर/एतराज है तो वह इस नोटिस के प्रकाशन होने के पश्चात् एक माह के अन्दर-अन्दर असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर वांछित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के निर्देश सम्बन्धित कार्यालय को दे दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 3-10-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
ऊना, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री परम देव शर्मा, नायब तहसीलदार, करसोग व अख्यार
सबर-रजिस्ट्रार, करसोग, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

मुकद्दमा नं0 1/2002

तारीख पेशी 30-9-2002

1. जय राम पुत्र बलीभद्र, निवासी भलियार, 2. भगत राम पुत्र पदमा राम, निवासी बखरौट, 3. धर्मेन्द्र पुत्र पदमा राम, निवासी बखरौट, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)

प्रार्थीगण।

बनाम

आम जनता

फरीकदोम।

उपरोक्त विषय पर हर आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार हि0 प्र0 राजपत्र के सूचित किया जाता है कि श्री परस राम पुत्र रूप चन्द, निवासी जोहड़, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हि0 प्र0 ने एक बसीयतनामा अपनी चल व अचल सम्पत्ति का सर्वश्री 1. जय राम पुत्र बलीभद्र, निवासी भलियार, तहसील करसोग, 2. भगत राम, 3. धर्मेन्द्र पुत्र पदमा राम, निवासी बखरौट, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हि0 प्र0 के नाम तहरीर करवाया है। बसीयतकर्ता की अब मौत हो चुकी है। अतः यह बसीयतनामा उपरोक्त प्रार्थीगण ने इस अदालत में बराये पंजीकरण पेश किया है।

अगर इस बसीयतनामा के पंजीकृत होने में किसी व्यक्ति का कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 31-10-2002 को सुबह 10.00 बजे अदालत या वकालतन अधोहस्ताक्षरी के न्यायालय में हाजिर होकर उजर पेश करे, अन्यथा आम जनता के विरुद्ध एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 30-9-2002 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

परम देव शर्मा,
उप-पंजीकाध्यक्ष, करसोग, जिला मण्डी (हि0 प्र0)।

भाग 6—भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन

-शून्य-

भाग 7—भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं

-शून्य-

अनुपरक

-शून्य-

नियन्त्रक मुद्रण तथा लखन सामग्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला-5 द्वारा मुद्रित तथा प्रकाशित